DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 965 IR 021 125

AUTHOR	Stiegemeier, Lois
TITLE	Language Integrated Technology Project Final Evaluation Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Educational Service District 113, Olympia, WA.; Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
PUB DATE	1999-08-00
NOTE	85p.; Prepared by Educational Technology Consulting, Olympia, WA. A Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grant Project.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Computer Assisted Instruction; Computer Software; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Learning Activities; Literacy; Professional Development; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Motivation; Staff Development; Student Attitudes; Training
IDENTIFIERS	Accelerated Reader Program; STAR Test Taking Strategy

ABSTRACT

The goal of the Language Integrated Technology Grant Project (LIT) consortium was to help provide critical components of successful reading programs through a combination of proven computer/print programs and teacher training. Through leadership provided by the Educational Service District 113 (Olympia, Washington), the LIT consortium of schools formed to address their reading needs. The LIT Consortium selected the Accelerated Reader, STAR, and Sentence Master computer-based programs as tools to increase reading achievement. LIT gave each of the schools new tools to use in reading instruction by providing each school with the software, hardware, and staff development necessary to use the software. Through the efforts of the teachers, librarians and technical staff at LIT schools, the project demonstrated that learning information systems such as Accelerated Reader and STAR coupled with focused staff development efforts can create environments with significant impact on reading motivation and achievement. Ultimately, these environments will improve students' ability to meet the reading goals of the Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements in reading Teachers in LIT schools report that the students are more excited about reading than before and demonstrate high motivation and engagement in reading in a relatively short period of time. This report consists of three main sections. An executive summary provides: a project synopsis; documentation of project activities; student data; professional development/teacher data; and recommendations. Project activities and results are discussed in the second section, which includes: evaluation plan; chronological list of project activities; staff development evaluations; student attitude surveys; student achievement data; teacher surveys; and focus group discussions. The third section includes the following appendixes: workshop evaluation forms and ratings; student attitude surveys; classroom data; teacher survey forms and results; and focus group discussion questions and transcripts. (AEF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

IR

ED 462 965

Language Integrated Technology Project
Final Evaluation Report

A Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grant Project
In Cooperation with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Prepared for

Deborah Hale
Educational Service District 113
601 McPhee Road, SW
Olympia, WA 98502

Prepared by

Lois Stiegemeier
Educational Technology Consulting
3203 Scotch Meadows Ct. SE
Olympia, WA 98501
(360) 923-5820

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Stiegemeier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

August 1999

IR021125

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Language Integrated Technology Project
Final Evaluation Report

A Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grant Project
In Cooperation with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Prepared for

Deborah Hale
Educational Service District 113
601 McPhee Road, SW
Olympia, WA 98502

Prepared by
Lois Stiegemeier
Educational Technology Consulting
3203 Scotch Meadows Ct. SE
Olympia, WA 98501
(360) 923-5820

August 1999

Contents

Acknowledgements ii

Executive Summary 1-6
- Project Synopsis 1-2
- Documentation of Project Activities 3
- Student Data 3-5
- Professional Development/Teacher Data 5-6
- Recommendations 6

Project Activities and Results 7-23
- Evaluation Plan 7
- Chronological List of Project Activities 7-8
- Staff Development Evaluations 8-12
- Student Attitude Surveys 13-16
- Student Achievement Data 16-18
- Teacher Surveys 18-20
- Focus Group Discussions 20-23

Appendices
- Appendix A: Workshop Evaluation Forms and Ratings
- Appendix B: Student Attitude Surveys
- Appendix C: Classroom Data
- Appendix D: Teacher Survey Forms and Results
- Appendix E: Focus Group Discussion Questions and Transcripts

Acknowledgements

The Language Integrated Technology (LIT) Grant Project would not have occurred without key individuals whose vision and hard work ensured the programs success. Deborah Hale's vision for this project and her work in developing the grant application was the foundation for LIT. Follow through and coordination of the project was the responsibility of Kaaren Lahaug, Jim Hill and Dan Warren with much help from Kim Hauss. Meadows Elementary School Librarian, Deborah Kilcup provided her expertise and support to other schools as they implemented the program. North Thurston School District stepped in and took on the role of fiscal agent when the original fiscal agent was unable to fulfill that responsibility. The evaluation teachers: Pete Robirds, Jan Morgan, Janice Williams, Bonnie Gilovich, Anne Jones, Connie Chicano, Lisa Sharma, Marcia Lewis, Mike Pirianian, Marie Wetzel, Jan Walberg, Randy Manley, Cathy Deschenes, Karen Ellingson, Erika Harner, Mrs. Mitchell, Kathy McGuire, Sheryl Nelson, Mrs. Narrance, Michele Harvey, Anna McCourt, Cindy Johnson, Mary Holmberg Gail Martin Jessica Ably Victor Garcia, Laurie McGovern Kim Matthews, Roger Pitts, Theresa Kelly-Brooks, and Mrs. Simmons who provided the information to make this evaluation possible.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Project Synopsis

The goal of the Language Integrated Technology Grant Project(LIT) consortium was to help provide critical components of successful reading programs through a combination of proven computer/print programs and teacher training. The project was funded by a grant through a combination of federal Technology Literacy Challenge Funds and Washington Technology Competitive funds, both administered by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Through leadership provided by ESD 113, the LIT consortium of schools formed to address their reading needs. The schools that made up the LIT consortium were:

District	Buildings	Evaluation Teacher
Aberdeen	AJ West Elementary	Pete Robirds
	Mc Dermoth Elementary	Jan Morgan
	Robert Gray Elementary	Janice Williams
	Alexander Young Elementary	Bonnie Gilovich
	Harbor High School	Anne Jones
	Central Park Elementary	Connie Chicano
	Stevens Elementary	Lisa Sharma
	Miller Junior High	Marcia Lewis
	Weatherwax High School*	None
Hoquiam	Hoquiam High School	Mike Pirianian
	Lincoln Elementary	Marie Wetzel
	Hoquiam Middle School	Jan Walberg
	Central Elementary	Randy Manley
		Cathy Deschenes
	Washington Elementary	Karen Ellingson
	Emerson School	Erika Harner
		Mrs. Mitchell
Montesano	Simpson Elementary	Kathy McGuire
	Beacon Elementary	Sheryl Nelson
	Montesano Junior/Senior High	Mrs. Narrance
Napavine	Napavine Elementary	Michele Harvey
North Thurston	Meadows Elementary	Anna McCourt/Cindy Johnson
		Mary Holmberg
		Gail Martin
Ocosta	Ocosta Elementary**	Jessica Ably
	Ocosta High School**	Victor Garcia
Pioneer	Pioneer Primary	Laurie McGovern
	Pioneer Intermediate	Kim Matthews
Rainier	Rainier Elementary	Roger Pitts
	Rainier High School*	None
Rochester	Grand Mound Elementary	Theresa Kelly-Brooks
	Rochester Primary	Mrs. Simmons

*Denotes schools that did not implement the grant.
**Denotes schools with difficulties implementing the program due to lack of books; these schools will be implementing the program in the 1999-2000 school year.

The LIT Consortium selected the Accelerated Reader, STAR, and Sentence Master computer-based programs as tools to increase reading achievement. These programs provided to participating schools a complete suite of reading development, comprehension and assessment software and for grades P-12. These tools were used in the districts' comprehensive reading program to motivate learners and provide feedback on student's progress.

LIT gave each of the schools new tools to use in reading instruction by providing each school with the software, hardware, and staff development necessary to use the software. In the grant application, the project was also to provide rotating sets of books that accompany the Accelerated Reader software using the ESD Media Center as the mechanism to ensure that sets of books were rotated to each school. Funding for the books was eliminated from the grant request by OSPI which created some problems in implementation since many schools noted that their collections were not large enough to accommodate the student demands for books once the program was implemented.

Training provided through LIT focused on the elements of a balanced reading and language development program, how the selected computer programs can play a role in those balanced programs, how to use the programs and the data supplied by the programs. ESD 113 in conjunction with Academic Excellence provided training to district staff enabling them to use the programs effectively.

Students participating in the Accelerated Reader program were pre-tested using the STAR computerized adaptive branching test for an accurate pre measurement of their reading ability. Based on the pretest and utilizing strategies learned in the staff development component, LIT teachers were able to set individual reading goals for students, have them read at the correct reading levels that will increase their reading skills, and monitor their progress relative to those goals. Students self-select books to read for which Accelerated Reader tests have been created. These books are coded for reading level and number of points possible for students to earn. Students take an Accelerated Reader computer-based reading comprehension test on a book immediately after reading it; the results of the test are automatically entered into the learning information system database. Teachers have access to the information in the database on individual and whole class levels, and can use the data to intervene when necessary, using proven strategies to ensure that students are reading at appropriate grade levels and are being successful at a given level before moving to the next reading level.

Through the efforts of the teachers, librarians and technical staff at LIT schools, the project demonstrated that learning information systems such as Accelerated Reader and STAR coupled with focused staff development efforts can create environments with significant impact on reading motivation and achievement. Ultimately these environments will improve students' ability to meet the reading goals of the Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements in reading. Teachers in LIT schools report that the students are more excited about reading than

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

before and demonstrate high motivation and engagement in reading in a relatively short period of time.

Documentation of Project Activities

Although full implementation of the LIT project was planned for early fall, 1998; unanticipated change in the fiscal agent for the project created delays in procurement of necessary hardware and software. By November, 1998 hardware and software were procured and most school installations were complete. Twenty-five schools received two computers to use to implement the project. Several schools experienced difficulties in using STAR and Accelerated Reader software on school networks and a few were not completely functional until January 1999.

ESD 113 provided five LIT training events over the course of the school year. Those training events were scheduled to build upon each other and increase the knowledge and skills of the team of teachers, librarians, administrative and support staff selected to be trained from each school. Initial training provided in fall, 1998 focused on the "nuts and bolts" of both the hardware and software to be used by the staff. The second level of training provided in January, 1999 focused on specific reading strategies and use of the information that the Accelerated Reader and STAR learning information systems provide to teachers, students and parents. Because teachers were so enthusiastic about the training and schools wanted to train even more of their staff, the beginning level training was repeated in the late spring, 1999 to accommodate additional teachers from LIT schools and others from non-grant schools at their own expense.

LIT project staff from ESD 113 provided technical assistance and on-site visits to all sites throughout the year. Technical assistance was also made available through Advantage Learning, the Accelerated Reader software developer and through Academic Excellence, the training arm of Advantage Learning.

A videotape documenting the outcomes of the LIT project was produced, as was a LIT website (**http://www.esd113.wednet.edu/lit**). The website contains information about the project and allows LIT teachers to document their success stories and access links to relevant Internet sites. The website included the use of Web Board software to provide a secured email discussion forum for LIT teachers. This web-based avenue for teacher discourse was an attempt to build a means for collegial exchange of information and ideas regarding implementation of the project.

Student Data

Each school participating in the project identified one evaluation classroom to provide student attitude and achievement data. Students in those classrooms completed student attitude surveys both before and after implementation of the project to provide information about change in attitudes regarding reading. Pre and post student achievement data was also collected from each classroom using the STAR adaptive branching computerized testing tool. The STAR report for each student gives students' Instructional Reading Level (IRL), Grade Equivalent (GE) Percentile Rank (PR, and Normal Curve Equivalency (NCE). The STAR computerized adaptive branching test has been developed, validated and normed using nationally

accepted techniques. It has been correlated with other standardized reading tests and deemed a valid tool for assessing reading performance.

By the end of the project, usable data was collected from 579 students that included pre and post STAR testing and AR information. In general, comparisons of the pre and post STAR and AR data shows that modest gains were made by students using Accelerated Reader.

- **Overall, students gained 1.95 NCEs and 2.53 Percentile Rank.**
- **The mean grade equivalent gain was 2.27.**
- **Students passed an average of 24 Accelerated Reader tests of an average 27 tests taken and**
- **Students earned an average 25.69 AR points.**

Although these gains seem modest, they must be seen as positive since most of the classrooms participating in the project were not able to fully implement the program until January, and some were unable to implement the program until March

Participation in the AR program was most beneficial for students in the lowest two quartiles—those with the greatest need to improve their reading skills. Analysis of the pre and post data showed that:

- Students in the lowest quartile (25th percentile or lower) gained an average of 7.56 NCE's and had a mean gain of 9.68 in their percentile rank.
- Students in the 26th to 50th percentile gained an average of 3.54 NCE's and had a mean gain of 6.91 in their percentile rank.
- A higher percentage of students reported higher interest in different literary genre ('liking reading certain kinds of books') following the implementation of the Accelerated Reading program than before.
- Students overwhelmingly noted that they liked the Accelerated Reader program and consistently agreed that they liked reading Books aligned to Accelerated Reader tests, they liked earning Accelerated Reader points, and that Accelerated Reader helps them to be a better reader.

In many ways, better and poorer readers answered the survey questions similarly. However, there are some differences. Better readers(those in the higher quartiles) were more likely to like reading, have favorite authors and books, and read just for fun. They also are far more likely to report that it is easy for them to read than poorer readers do, and they wish they had more time to read. Those in the highest quartile are more likely to read every day at home and to like reading certain kinds of books. However, everyone sees reading as important in school and report that only sometimes do they choose reading over watching t.v. or talk to others about the things they read. The Accelerated Reader program however has a big impact on the lower level student, and those students report that they like earning AR points and believe that AR helps them become better readers as often as those who are better readers. The student achievement data clearly indicates that the program has a significant impact on the lower level reader; those for whom the program was intended, and it would be anticipated that with additional time in the program, the gains for these students would be even greater. These are very significant findings considering that most of these students only experienced four to six months of program participation.

As a result of the LIT project, teachers observe that:

- Students read more and are often reading during recess and other times at school..
- Students are sharing their favorite books with others.
- Students are excited to take the AR tests.
- Students want to read challenging or quality books.
- There is a huge impact on frustrated or reluctant readers.
- Student skills in comprehension are improving and they are increasing their reading levels.

Professional Development/Teacher Data

The LIT project provided Accelerated Reader, and STAR software for the entire school to use, but could not train all teachers in all schools. LIT focused on training teams of teachers, librarians and para-professionals to utilize the learning information systems and reading strategies in their classrooms. The model intended was that these teams would return to their schools and provide training and motivation to other teachers to utilize the programs, but that evaluation would focus on a single classroom in each building. All workshops provided to LIT schools were rated very highly by the participants; however, in some cases classroom teachers did not consistently attend all the staff development workshops which were developed to build upon one another. The staff development portion of the project was seen as an important part of the project. Teachers said that the staff development component assisted them by giving them lots of specific implementation ideas. It also created enthusiasm for the program and created a demand for additional training for other teachers in their schools.

By February 1999, 30 teachers in 26 of the 28 schools had returned their Fall Teacher Survey. See Appendix D for copies of the Survey Forms and results of those surveys.
This initial survey showed that most teachers believed that:

- They were employing many of the strategies necessary to increase reading skills.
- They were able to access and use information about their students' reading skills to tailor instruction.
- They wanted additional strategies to motivate their students to read independently

Teachers participating in this project have admirable goals for the use of these programs in their classrooms. They noted that as a result of participation they wanted to :

- Get their students excited about or instill in them a love of reading
- Increase students' reading comprehension
- Increase their own knowledge of their students' reading levels
- Guide students to choose books that are appropriate for them
- Increase their students' confidence and self esteem
- Have their students do more reading
- Increase students' reading of high quality authors and "real" literature

The Spring Teacher survey asked teachers many of the same questions, plus elicited additional information about their use of the Accelerated Reader program and Reading Renaissance strategies. Surveys were collected from 23 teachers and librarians involved in the project. See Appendix D for detailed results of this survey. Results of the survey show that:

- Teachers had a positive experience participating in the project.

- Teachers felt they have additional reading information and strategies that help them in increasing their students' reading abilities.
- Most teachers were able to devote between 30 and 60 minutes daily for their students' reading practice.
- Teachers were able to utilize specific strategies such as Duolog reading, reading logs, mini-lessons, and reading incentives or rewards
- Library circulation rates in these schools increased, sometimes dramatically
- Staff in these schools including librarians, technology coordinators and teachers spent many additional hours implementing the program.

Recommendations

The LIT project is one of the most dramatic in terms of positive effects both to students and teachers that this evaluator has observed. The enthusiasm of teachers, students and in most cases librarians and their response to the training and the opportunities to assist their students in developing the most basic academic skill was overwhelming. Student gains, especially in light of the short amount of time were high. The challenges and delays of the project were unforeseen and beyond the control of project staff. Even those schools most frustrated by delays and technical problems of software acquisition and networking issues were at the end of the project enthused and happy to have been involved. **The primary recommendation of this evaluator is to continue to develop and seek funding for these types of consortia where relatively small investments in hardware and software have significant results in student achievement and teacher skills.** A significant outgrowth of the project was the demand from schools for additional training to assist them in implementing Accelerated Reader. ESD 113 has responded to that demand by both offering workshops during the 1999-2000 school year, and by offering to broker training for schools expressing interest in whole school training. Deborah Kilcup, the librarian from Meadows Elementary School will be providing a portion of that training. Several schools did not implement the program as agreed in the grant application. Based on that information, other secondary recommendations include:

- Earlier site visits to ensure that all schools involved in the project actually are carrying out the project activities and to identify and assist if schools are having difficulties.
- Continue to provide additional opportunities for project participants to share their implementation ideas and strategies
- Continue to provide the high quality training that enables proper use of learning information software

Project Evaluation Activities and Results

Evaluation Plan

In order to assess the impact of the use of the STAR and Accelerated Reader computer based programs in schools participating in the LIT Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grant, a variety of evaluation activities have occurred. Data collection activities were used to address these key evaluation questions:

- To what extent has the use of Accelerated Reader and STAR been integrated into a comprehensive reading and language development program?
- What impact has the project had on students' motivation to read?
- What impact has the project had on students' reading skills?
- What was the overall quality of the professional development?
- What challenges were encountered during the implementation of the project and how were they or could they have been overcome?

Chronological List of Project Activities

Activity Log--those involved in implementing the project have maintained an activity log documenting each of the project activities. Activity logs described what occurred, the type of event or activity, who was involved, and how it relates to the project. Activity logs were submitted to Educational Technology Consulting on an ongoing basis. The activity logs indicate that there were delays getting software and hardware due to an unanticipated change in fiscal agents and installing the software on networks and some computers. Another unanticipated change in the project was the denial of funding for sets of books that are necessary to Accelerated Reader that were to be rotated among participating schools. Other than those challenges, the implementation proceeded as outlined in the grant application.

Date	Activity
September, 1998	Start of grant and change in fiscal agent causing new procedures to be used in acquiring hardware and software. This unanticipated change caused hardware and software acquisition and installation to be delayed by approximately 6 weeks.
September 15, 1998	LIT Orientation: This orientation to the project for districts participating in the grant included the following topics: grant overview, expectations, software, staff development and training activities, evaluation activities, project website, and project video. Demonstration disks and an iMac computer were available for districts to review.
September 21-24/1998	Reading Renaissance I: This training covered the basics of the goals of Reading Renaissance, the use of Accelerated Reader and STAR software and strategies to motivate, instruct, monitor and intervene in reading. The training also covered how to implement the program in

	the classroom.
September through December, 1998	Installation of all hardware and software. The LIT project equipped schools new to Accelerated Reader with the Super Kit software appropriate for the school's grade levels. Schools already using Accelerated Reader were provided additional test disks and the STAR software. 25 schools were also equipped with either an iMac or Dell computer dedicated to the use of Accelerated Reader and Sentence Master software.
October 28-29/98	**Level 0 Training:** This workshop focused on giving LIT participants hands-on basic training using the computers provided to them in their grant. Not all LIT schools received computers; thus not all schools participated in this training event.
January 25-28, 1999	**Reading Renaissance II:** This session was the second of the Reading Renaissance workshops presented by the Institute for Academic Excellence. These two-day workshops focused on advanced and intensive reading strategies and management of reading programs including Accelerated Reader and STAR. The training was scaffolded upon the components of the Reading Renaissance I training that occurred in September. Participants were given specific techniques in Duolog tutoring, monitoring and adjusting instructional reading strategies and tools to utilize computerized reporting.
March-May, 1999	LIT coordinator, Kaaren Lahaug visits LIT sites to observe and assist where necessary. Technicians Dan Hill and Jim Hill provided technical assistance to sites experiencing hardware and software difficulties.
May 20. 1999	Reading Renaissance I: This additional training was an outgrowth of the popularity of the grant and the training. Grant participants and other s were invited to attend this basic training at per participant cost. One hundred participants attended this training; 35 of those (30%) were additional staff from LIT grant schools; fees for these participants were paid by the grant. All other participant fees were paid by the individual s.
May 21, 199	Accelerated Reader Hands-on Training: This additional training focused on hands-on practice in using the Accelerated Reader and STAR software, generating and using the computer-generated reports.
June 8-9	Focus group discussion sessions at two sites, ESD 113 and Hoquiam High School for participating teachers to answer questions regarding project implementation.

Staff Development Evaluations

Educational Technology Consulting, in cooperation with the project director, developed a workshop evaluation form to gather information about the usefulness of the professional development workshops offered through the project. Participating teachers completed the workshop evaluation form upon the completion of each workshop conducted as part of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

project. Completed forms were sent to Educational Technology Consulting for tabulation and analysis. During the period from August through May 1998, workshop evaluations were submitted for the Level 0 Training, Reading Renaissance I, Reading Renaissance II, and Sentence Master training. Training was held both at ESD 113 in Olympia and at the CELL Center and other sites in Aberdeen for the convenience of the schools participating in the grant.

Workshops were evaluated using a workshop evaluation form combining Lichert scale combined with open-ended questions. Participants were asked to evaluate both the content and facilitators of each workshop based on the following scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The following information summarizes how each workshop funded by the grant was rated by participants. Full summaries for each workshop including mean ratings can be found in Appendix A.

LIT Orientation Kick-off
Date: 9/15/98
Location: ESD 113, Olympia
Facilitator: Debbie Hale, Kaaren Lahaug
Time: 2.5 hours
Number of participants: 50-60
This orientation to the project for districts participating in the grant included the following topics: grant overview, expectations, software, staff development and training activities, evaluation activities, project website, and project video. Demonstration disks and an iMac computer were available for districts to review. Participants expressed enthusiasm for the training events planned. Many wanted to add staff to the grant activities. After the event, LIT staff received multiple calls about: 1.) Information for district staff unable to attend the event; 2.) The possibility of sending additional staff to the training events, and 3.) Districts not involved in the grant expressing interest in participation. Since this wasn't a formal workshop but an informational event, attendees did not complete the workshop evaluation forms. The organizers of this event indicated that they felt participants needed additional time to review information given to them in the project binders, time for interaction among participants. In addition, LIT staff noted a need for information regarding the AR/STAR program and its impact to be presented to participants either from current users of the products or through a video or slideshow with research on the results of the program.

Reading Renaissance I
Date: 9/21-24/1998 (Two locations, two consecutive evenings at each location)
Location: ESD 113, Olympia; CELL Center, Aberdeen
Facilitator: Linda Borgen from Academic Excellence
Time: 6 hours for each workshop
Number of participants: 88
Fifty-eight workshop evaluations were submitted by workshop participants. There were no significant differences in ratings between the participants at both sites, and the scores given here reflect averages from both the workshop locations. In general, this workshop and the facilitator were rated quite high. This training covered the basics of the goals of Reading Renaissance, the use of Accelerated Reader and Star and strategies to motivate, instruct,

monitor and intervene in reading instruction. The training also covered how to implement the program in the classroom. The workshop was lecture style format with outstanding workbooks and PowerPoint presentation. Teachers had time at the end of the session to do some building level planning for overall reading improvement and ideas to implement the program. LIT staff noted that the most significant outcome of this session was that people wanted to start right away; participants were very enthusiastic. As one participant noted, " The best thing was the fact that I could picture using this program at my school." Another said, "I was so excited about the reading program, I couldn't wait to come back to the second half the next night." The trainer generated extensive enthusiasm for management and implementation of the program. As in the other session in Aberdeen, the lesson learned was to schedule training during the day and later in the fall. Participants were enthused, but stressed about the time of day and how early it was in the school year; there were multiple conflicts with school functions such as open house. In addition, participants would have liked to have additional information about strategies they could employ to use the program with Special Education, Gifted or other special student populations.

Both the Reading Renaissance I workshops included a hands-on training session in computer laboratories. The objective of that part of the workshops was to give participants an opportunity to see features of the software and to demonstrate how the computer software fits into the Accelerated Reading program. Participants followed the facilitator on their computers as well as using a flip type workbook set up at each station. The laboratories at each site were conducive to this part of the workshop. The presenter's skill and knowledge kept the session moving and was quite impressive. There were few technical problems at these sessions. All participants seemed to be able to follow the presenter and understand the features she pointed out. Having the software preloaded on the machines was helpful, if not essential. The depth of the software was impressive, though it would have been good to see how it performed in a networked situation with several users accessing the database simultaneously. Some schools expressed interest in a cross platform version; however, a cross-platform version is not available at this time.

The primary change LIT staff recommended would be to have the session during the day rather than in the evening. Budget constraints and the need to limit the use of substitutes and release time dictated the choice of time. That, however was the only component of the training that garnered negative comments by participants. LIT staff noted that the two-day session seemed to work well since there was a lot of content to cover.

Workshop Title: Level 0 Training
Date: 10/28-29/98 (Two locations for this workshop)
Presenter: Jim Hill
Time: 3 hours
Number of participants: 38
About 38 people attended these workshops, however, only 18 workshop evaluation forms were returned. This workshop focused on giving LIT participants hands-on basic training using the computers provided to them in their grant. Not all LIT schools received computers; thus not all schools participated in this training event. This workshop received higher than average scores, and was favorably received by participants.

Workshop Title: Reading Renaissance II
Date: 1/25-26 and 1/27-28 (Two locations for this workshop)
Presenter: Penny Reinart and Lisa Finley from Academic Excellence
Time: 2 days for each workshop
Number of participants: 61

This session was the second of the Reading Renaissance workshops presented by the Institute for Academic Excellence. These two-day workshops focused on advanced and intensive reading strategies and management of reading programs including Accelerated Reader and STAR. The training was scaffolded upon the components of the Reading Renaissance I training that occurred in September. Participants were given specific techniques in Duolog tutoring, monitoring and adjusting instructional reading strategies and tools to utilize computerized reporting. Participants seemed inspired to go back to their classrooms and spend more time on the specific reading strategies learned. In the second training, which took place in Aberdeen, many of the schools had been having problems using the programs. The two facilitators were able to isolate the problems and address them. They encouraged teachers to bring their principals to the second day of this training. Many indicated that this was the best staff development they had had in their many years of teaching. Principals could see the impact they can make in their reading program and their students' achievement.

LIT staff indicated that the most significant impact of this training was the design used that encouraged teams of teachers to attend. At least two people and sometimes more from each building involved in the project attended. The teams were able to work together and come up with ideas specific to their school environment. In many of the teams there was a district representative (Chapter/LSP. Title Coordinator or principal), a librarian, a classroom teacher, a paraprofessional and in some cases a technology coordinator. Every team had at least two of these positions, but most had more. The synergy and ideas of the teams were inspiring to all.

Participants also seemed to enjoy having two trainers from Academic Excellence who both had working, practical knowledge of using the programs in their own schools they were able to integrate that first-hand knowledge and experience into their presentation and inspire attendees with their personal experiences.

Workshop Title: Overview of Sentence Master
Date: 3/8/99
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Kaaren Lahaug
Time: 3 hours
Number of participants: 16

This short session targeted the schools participating in use of the Sentence Master program. Sixteen participants attended the session, though only 8 workshop evaluation forms were

returned. The objective of this workshop was to introduce participants to the software, and give hands-on instruction and practice using the software. Participants received an overview of the reading software designed for reluctant or emergent readers. Participants each had their own computer for hands-on practice in the program. Participants seemed pleased to be able to break out in small groups at the end to share management ideas, tips and strategies with each other. The workshop evaluation forms showed that participants were enthusiastic about the session and found it useful to them.

An unanticipated outgrowth of the LIT grant was the additional demand for Reading Renaissance training. Responding to that need, ESD 113 offered two additional workshops—Reading Renaissance 1 and Accelerated Reader Hands-On training on May 20 and 21 respectively. Grant funds were used to allow 35 additional participants to attend from LIT schools. Other districts in the ESD 113 service area were invited to attend the training at their own expense. . Due to the popularity of this training spurred by the LIT grant, ESD 113 is planning a series of Reading Renaissance training events during the 1999-2000 school year. These non-grant funded training events used a slightly different workshop evaluation form, however results were as favorable as previous workshops.

Workshop Title: Reading Renaissance I
Date: 5/20/99
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Julianne Miller
Time: One day
Number of participants: 100

One hundred participants (100) attended this workshop; thirty-five (35) of those were teachers from LIT grant schools. This training covered the basics of the goals of Reading Renaissance, the use of Accelerated Reader and Star and strategies to motivate, instruct, monitor and intervene in reading. The training also covered how to implement the program in the classroom. The workshop was lecture style format with outstanding workbooks and PowerPoint presentation. Comments from participants noted that the practical aspects and the skill and humor of the presenter were important aspects of the workshop.

Workshop Title: Accelerated Reader Hands-On
Date: 5/21/99 (two sessions—morning and afternoon)
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Julianne Miller
Time: 3 hours for each session
Number of participants: 43

A total of 43 participants attended this workshop; eighteen (18) of those were teachers from LIT grant schools. This training covered the basics use of Accelerated Reader and Star and software, with hands-on practice for all participants with computers and the software. Evaluations were collected from 41 of the participants. Comments from participants noted that the practical aspects of the training and the hands-on approach were important aspects of the workshop.

Student Attitude Surveys

Brief attitude surveys were administered to students in the evaluation classrooms during the fall of 1998 and spring, 1999. See Appendix B for copies of the student surveys. The survey was intended to gather information to determine to what extend students enjoy reading and how much time during a typical week they spend reading. The spring survey was intended to elicit attitudes of students towards Accelerated Reader.

Results of the Fall Student survey show the following:

	YES! 1	Yes 2	??? 3	No 4	NO! 5	Mean	n=
1. I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.	299 46.6%	203 31.6%	62 9.6%	35 5.5%	43 6.7%	1.94	642
2. I have favorite books and authors.	309 47.8%	150 23.2%	79 12.2%	72 11.1%	37 5.7%	2.15	647
3. I'm not good at reading.	89 13.9%	77 12%	76 11.9%	133 20.7%	266 41.5%	3.64	641
4. Reading is important in school	469 72.4%	115 17.7%	37 5.7%	17 2.6%	10 1.5%	1.43	648
5. I choose reading over watching the t.v.	137 21.1%	109 16.8%	144 22.2%	106 16.4%	152 23.5%	3.04	648
6. I read just for fun.	219 33.9%	187 28.9%	89 13.8%	69 10.7%	82 12.7%	2.39	646
7. It's easy for me to read.	301 46.6%	176 27.2%	79 12.2%	54 8.4%	36 5.6%	1.99	646
8. I read everyday at home.	151 23.8%	140 22%	91 14.3%	153 24.1%	100 15.7%	2.86	635
9. I like going to the library and selecting books to read.	343 53.2%	134 20.8%	72 11.2%	52 8%	44 6.8%	1.95	645
10. Reading is NOT one of my favorite activities.	132 20.5%	82 12.7%	85 13.2%	124 19.3%	221 34.3%	3.34	644
11. I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).	294 45.6%	142 22%	105 16.3%	48 7.4%	56 8.7%	2.12	645
12. I like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.	192 29.9%	158 24.6%	97 15.1%	84 13%	111 17.3%	2.63	642
13. I wish I had more time to read.	271 41.8%	139 21.4%	92 14.2%	71 10.9%	76 11.7%	2.29	649
14. I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.	353 54.4%	147 22.7%	81 12.5%	26 4%	42 6.5%	1.86	649
15. Reading helps me be a better writer.	263 40.4%	163 25%	107 16.4%	52 8%	66 10.1%	2.22	651
16. I think reading is hard work.	71 11%	64 9.9%	86 13.3%	130 20%	297 45.8%	3.80	648
	Daily	Once a Week	Once a Month	Maybe once a year	Never		
17. I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.	310 48.6%	193 30.3%	49 7.7%	25 3.9%	61 9.6%	1.98	638
18. I go to the public library.	42 6.6%	131 20.5%	206 32.2%	131 20.5%	129 20.2%	3.28	639
19. I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.	167 25.9%	177 27.4%	84 13%	38 5.9%	180 27.9%	2.82	646
20. I read email messages or Web page information.	121 18.8%	108 16.7%	72 11.2%	37 5.7%	307 47.6%	3.47	645

The Fall Student Attitude Survey shows that most of the students participating enjoy reading and see themselves as good at reading. Most report reading daily at home and many go to the public library at least once a month.

The student attitude survey was repeated in the spring with the addition of a few questions designed to elicit the student attitudes regarding Accelerated Reader. One question was dropped from the survey since it had less to do with reading than the access students have to the Internet. Surveys from the students for whom both pre and post STAR and Accelerated Reader data was received were analyzed. The results of the Spring Student Attitude Survey show the following:

	YES! 1	Yes 2	Maybe 3	No 4	NO! 5	Mean	n=
1. I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.	270 54.3%	130 26.2%	56 11.3%	15 3%	26 5.2%	1.79	497
2. I have favorite books and authors.	235 47.2%	126 25.3%	55 11%	57 11.4%	25 5%	2.02	498
3. I'm NOT a good reader.	35 7%	38 7.7%	60 12.1%	104 21%	258 52%	4.06	496
4. Reading is important in school.	370 74.8%	84 17%	27 5.5%	8 1.6%	6 1.2%	1.38	495
5. I choose reading over watching TV.	99 20.3%	86 17.6%	137 28%	72 14.7%	95 19.4%	2.96	489
6. I read just for fun.	168 34.4%	114 23.3%	87 17.8%	51 10.4%	69 14.1%	2.47	489
7. I like reading Accelerated Reader Books.	275 58.1%	91 19.2%	58 12.3%	22 4.7%	26 5.5%	1.80	473
8. It's easy for me to read.	247 50.2%	124 25.2%	74 15%	29 5.9%	18 3.7%	1.88	492
9. I read everyday at home.	103 21%	85 17.4%	133 27.1%	102 20.8%	67 13.7%	2.89	490
10. I like going to the library and selecting books to read.	284 57.4%	91 18.4%	63 12.8%	23 4.6%	34 6.8%	1.85	495
11. I DON'T like to read.	33 6.7%	27 5.5%	46 9.4%	92 18.7%	293 59.7%	4.19	491
12. I like earning Accelerated Reader points.	326 68.3%	64 13.4%	42 8.8%	20 4.2%	25 5.2%	1.65	477
13. I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).	280 56.7%	95 19.2%	58 11.7%	36 7.3%	25 5.1%	1.85	494
14. I like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.	146 29.4%	113 22.7%	110 22.1%	61 12.3%	67 13.5%	2.58	497
15. I wish I had more time to read.	208 41.7%	111 22.2%	92 18.4%	38 7.6%	50 10%	2.22	499
16. I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.	267 54.2%	118 23.9%	65 13.2%	29 5.9%	14 2.8%	1.79	493
17. Accelerated Reader helps me to be a better reader.	279 58.5%	88 18.5%	56 11.7%	26 5.5%	28 5.8%	1.82	477
18. Reading helps me be a better writer.	181 36.5%	114 23%	106 21.4%	46 9.3%	49 9.9%	2.33	496
19. I think reading is hard work.	50 10%	40 8%	54 10.8%	104 21%	250 50.2%	3.93	498
	Daily	Once a Week	Once a Month	Maybe once a year	Never		
20. I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.	245 49.1%	155 31.1%	42 8.4%	23 4.6%	34 6.8%	1.89	499
21. I go to the public library.	13 2.6%	98 19.7%	174 34.9%	135 27.1%	78 15.7%	3.34	498
22. I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.	129 26%	144 29%	60 12.1%	37 7.4%	127 25.5%	2.78	497

A comparison of these two attitude surveys shows very little difference in student attitudes regarding reading from before and after the implementation of the Accelerated Reader program in their classroom. The most revealing change was the fact that many more students disagreed with the statement "I DON'T like to read"; however that could be due to the fact that it was worded differently in the pre-survey and teachers reported that the wording was confusing especially for younger students. The most significant changes in attitudes included:

- A higher percentage of students disagreed with the statement "I'm NOT a good reader." In the post project survey
- A higher percentage of students reported liking reading various genre ("certain kinds of books") following the implementation of the Accelerated Reading program than before.

Students overwhelmingly noted that they liked the Accelerated Reader program and consistently agreed that they liked reading books aligned to Accelerated Reader tests, they liked earning Accelerated Reader points, and that Accelerated Reader helps them to be a better reader.

The following chart compares the mean scores in the pre and post student attitude surveys.

	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Comparison of attitude answers
I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.	1.94	1.79	78.2% students answered positively in the pre survey ; 80.5% in post survey
I have favorite books and authors.	2.15	2.02	71% said Yes in pre as opposed to 72.5% in post survey
I'm NOT a good reader.	3.64	4.06	62.2% disagreed with this statement in the pre survey; 73% in post.
Reading is important in school.	1.43	1.38	90.1% in pre agreed with this; 91.8% in post.
I choose reading over watching TV.	3.04	2.96	No real change—both surveys noted show that 37.9% agreed with this statement.
I read just for fun.	2.39	2.47	62.8% agreed in the pre survey; 57.7% in the post.
I like reading Accelerated Reader Books.		1.80	Not asked in the pre survey. Post survey indicates that 77.3% like reading AR books.
It's easy for me to read.	1.99	1.88	73.8% said yes in the pre survey; 75.4% agree in the post survey
I read everyday at home.	2.86	2.89	The pre survey shows that 45.8% read at home everyday; the post survey shows a drop to 38.4%
I like going to the library and selecting books to read.	1.95	1.85	74% answered positively in the pre survey; 75.8% agreed in the post survey.
I DON'T like to read.	3.34	4.19	56.3% indicated that reading is not one of their favorite activities in the pre survey. There was some student confusion answering this question so it was changed in the post survey, which elicited a disagreement with this statement from 78.4% of the students.
I like earning Accelerated Reader points.		1.65	Not asked in the pre survey. In the post survey, 81.7% of the students indicated that they like earning AR points.
I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).	2.12	1.85	This question elicited a higher percentage of positive responses in the post survey. The pre survey showed 67.8% agreed; the post had 75.9% agreement rate.
I like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.	2.63	2.58	Very little change—54.5% of pre survey students agreed; 52.1% agreed in the post

			survey.
I wish I had more time to read.	2.29	2.22	63.2% agreed in the pre survey; 63.9% agreed in the post survey.
I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.	1.86	1.79	77.1% agreed in the pre survey; 78.1% agreed in the post survey.
Accelerated Reader helps me to be a better reader.		1.82	Not asked in the pre survey. Post survey revealed that 77% of students think that AR helps them read better.
Reading helps me be a better writer.	2.22	2.33	A drop was seen in the positive correlation students' see between reading and writing. In the pre survey 65.4% of the students think that reading helps them write; in the post survey only 59.5% agreed.
I think reading is hard work.	3.80	3.93	A slight increase was seen in the percentage of students who disagreed with this statement. In the pre survey, 65.8% of the students disagreed while in the post survey 71.2% disagreed.
I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.	1.98	1.89	A slightly larger percentage of students indicate that they read at home daily. Pre survey showed that 48.6% read at home daily and 30.3% reported reading at least one a week. The post survey showed that 49.1% report reading daily and 31.1% read once a week.
I go to the public library.	3.28	3.34	Most students in both surveys report that they go to the public library once a month (32.2% pre; 34.9% post)
I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.	2.82	2.78	No real change in the frequency that students report talking to their parents or friends about things they have read. Interestingly, just about the same percentage of students in both surveys (roughly 26%) are at both ends of the continuum. Nearly 26% talk about their readings daily and another 26% report never talking about things they read.

Student Achievement Data

If self-reported attitudes haven't really changed, what about student achievement as measured by the STAR assessments? Evaluating teachers sent a STAR report for each student which gives students' Instructional Reading Level (IRL), Grade Equivalent (GE) Percentile Rank (PR, and Normal Curve Equivalency (NCE) to Educational Technology Consulting three times during the project. The STAR computerized adaptive branching test has been developed, validated and normed using nationally accepted techniques. It has been correlated with other standardized reading tests and deemed a valid tool for assessing reading performance.

Teachers also sent an Accelerated Reader Report that tracks the number of AR tests passed, points earned, and the average reading level the student is choosing. Since a large number of schools had difficulties getting started with the program prior to January, many sent only a beginning and ending STAR report. Those two reports were used to measure student growth from the beginning to the end of the project. See Appendix C for classroom summaries of student achievement data submitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The project experienced delays in their use of the STAR computer program due to the fiscal agent constraints in procurement and unanticipated technical problems associated with use of the computer programs on a network and with the iMac computers provided to some schools. These delays set back the deadline date for school submission of STAR and AR student reports. Most teachers were finally able to submit their first STAR student reports by early January. Most teachers were implementing AR by January, though some reported not being able to implement the program until as late as March and several were not able to implement at all.

By the end of the project, usable data was collected from 579 students that included pre and post STAR testing and AR information. In general, comparisons of the pre and post STAR and AR data shows that **modest gains** were made by students using Accelerated Reader.

- **Overall, students gained 1.95 NCEs and 2.53 Percentile Rank.**
- **The mean grade equivalent gain was 2.27.**
- **Students passed an average of 24 Accelerated Reader tests of an average 27 tests taken and**
- **Students earned an average 25.69 AR points.**

Although these gains seem modest, they must be seen as positive since most of the classrooms participating in the project were not able to fully implement the program until January, and some were unable to implement the program until March

Participation in the AR program was very beneficial for students in the lowest two quartiles—those with the greatest need to improve their reading skills. Analysis of the pre and post data showed that:

- Students in the lowest quartile (25th percentile or lower) gained an average of 7.56 NCE's and had a mean gain of 9.68 in their percentile rank.
- Students in the 26th to 50th percentile gained an average of 3.54 NCE's and had a mean gain of 6.91 in their percentile rank.

These are very significant findings considering that most of these students only experienced four to six months of program participation.

Over half the students (54%) showed positive National Curve Equivalency (NCE) gains. Most of those (259 students or 48%) gained at least 3 NCE's or more. Some students gained over 10 NCE's. Particular classrooms also noted exceptional gains. See Appendix C for individual classroom information. Eighteen classrooms showed positive average NCE gains ranging from 0.12 to 10.56.

Students in this project are distributed, as one would expect. Of the students with pre and post data, there were 151 students were in the lowest quartile (PR rank of 25 and below). Another 150 students were in the third quartile (PR ranks of 26-50); 147 students were in the second quartile (PR rank of 51-75) and 131 students tested in the highest quartile (PR of over 75). Correlation was made between the STAR information collected and the Spring Student Attitude Survey. The following are the mean scores for students identified in the fall in each of the quartiles.

	Percentile Rank of Students			
	25 and under	26-49	50-74	Over 75

1. I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.	2.14	1.83	1.65	1.52
2. I have favorite books and authors.	2.03	2.28	1.90	1.85
3. I'm not a good reader.	3.45	4.00	4.19	4.62
4. Reading is important in school	1.44	1.35	1.37	1.33
5. I choose reading over watching the t.v.	3.19	3.04	2.83	2.78
6. I read just for fun.	2.85	2.53	2.26	2.21
7. I like reading Accelerated Reader books.	1.95	1.74	1.78	1.75
8. It's easy for me to read.	2.35	1.95	1.68	1.53
9. I read everyday at home.	3.11	3.12	2.70	2.63
10. I like going to the library and selecting books to read.	2.01	1.83	1.88	1.71
11. I DON'T like to read.	3.79	4.08	4.36	4.53
12. I like earning Accelerated Reader points	1.66	1.68	1.62	1.64
13. I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).	1.84	1.87	1.97	1.70
14. I like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.	2.68	2.60	2.43	2.62
15. I wish I had more time to read.	2.43	2.23	2.16	2.02
16. I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.	1.98	1.88	1.79	1.51
17. Accelerated Reader helps me to be a better reader.	1.84	1.87	1.63	1.97
18. Reading helps me be a better writer.	2.56	2.20	2.23	2.33
19. I think reading is hard work.	3.63	3.91	4.07	4.12
20. I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.	2.25	1.93	1.78	1.57
21. I go to the public library.	3.47	3.35	3.29	3.21
22. I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.	3.03	2.77	2.64	2.66
Mean NCE change from pre to post	+7.56	+3.54	+0.43	-4.63
Mean Grade Percentile rank change	+9.68	+6.91	-0.49	-7.33
Mean AR points earned	19.65	24.89	28.44	36.46
Mean Grade Equivalent change	+0.89	1.31	0.28	0.33

In many ways, better and poorer readers answered the survey questions similarly. However, there are some differences. Better readers (those in the higher quartiles) were more likely to like reading, have favorite authors and books, and read just for fun. They also are far more likely to report that it is easy for them to read than poorer readers do, and they wish they had more time to read. Those in the highest quartile are more likely to read every day at home and to like reading certain kinds of books. However, everyone sees reading as important in school and report that only sometimes do they choose reading over watching t.v. or talk to others about the things they read. The Accelerated Reader program however has a big impact on the lower level student, and those students report that they like earning AR points and believe that AR helps them become better readers as often as those who are better readers. The student achievement data clearly indicates that the program has a significant impact on the lower level reader; those for whom the program was intended, and it would be anticipated that with additional time in the program, the gains for these students would be even greater.

Teacher Surveys

Educational Technology Consulting, in cooperation with the project director, developed a brief questionnaire that was administered immediately after the initial professional development was been completed. A classroom teacher in each school participating in the project was identified to participate in the evaluation of the project. While the programs may be implemented in

several or all classrooms in these buildings, one teacher and one classroom was used to collect data for evaluation purposes. A similar survey was administered again at the conclusion of the project. The initial questionnaire was designed to gather the teachers' feedback about their need for the professional development, the Accelerated Reader and S.T.A.R. programs, and issues they face in improving student performance in reading.

By February 28, 30 teachers in 26 of the 28 schools had returned their Fall Teacher Survey. See Appendix D for copies of the Survey Forms and results of those surveys.
This initial survey showed that most teachers believed that:

- They were employing many of the strategies necessary to increase reading skills.
- They were able to access and use information about their students' reading skills to tailor instruction.
- They wanted additional strategies to motivate their students to read independently

Teachers participating in this project have admirable goals for the use of these programs in their classrooms. They noted that as a result of participation they wanted to:

- Get their students excited about or instill in them a love of reading
- Increase students' reading comprehension
- Increase their own knowledge of their students' reading levels
- Guide students to choose books that are appropriate for them
- Increase their students' confidence and self esteem
- Have their students do more reading
- Increase students' reading of high quality authors and "real" literature

Teachers in these schools face a variety of issues related to their improvement of their students' reading skills including:

- Lack of parental interest and support for reading.
- The varied reading levels of their students
- Limited time they can devote to reading
- Special needs of ESL students
- Lack of readiness skills

The Spring Teacher survey asked teachers many of the same questions, plus elicited additional information about their use of the Accelerated Reader program and Reading Renaissance strategies. Surveys were collected from 23 teachers and librarians involved in the project. See Appendix D for detailed results of this survey. Results of the survey show that:

1. Teachers had a positive experience participating in the project.
2. Teachers felt they have additional reading information and strategies that help them in increasing their students' reading abilities.
3. Most teachers were able to devote between 30 and 60 minutes daily for their students' reading practice.
4. Teachers were able to utilize specific strategies such as Duolog reading, reading logs, mini-lessons, and reading incentives or rewards
5. Library circulation rates in these schools increased, sometimes dramatically
6. Staff in these schools including librarians, technology coordinators and teachers spent many additional hours implementing the program.

By the end of the project, teachers involved noted significant impacts on their students' interest and motivation in reading such as:

- Students read more and are often reading during recess and other times at school.
- Students are sharing their favorite books with others.
- Students are excited to take the AR tests.
- Students want to read challenging or quality books.
- There is a huge impact on frustrated or reluctant readers.
- Student skills in comprehension are improving and they are increasing their reading levels.

The staff development portion of the project was seen as an important part of the project. Teachers said that the staff development component assisted them by giving them many specific implementation ideas. It also created enthusiasm for the program and created a demand for additional training.

Most of the teachers noted that the program had a positive impact on parental involvement ranging from parents noticing that their children are reading more to parent groups funding books and awards.

Finally, the teachers responding to this survey noted that the primary benefits of the program are the students' excitement about the program as seen through their talking about and sharing books and setting reading goals for themselves. Teachers also noted that the reading gains they see in their students are helping increase achievement in other subjects as well. Teachers feel that they are more clearly focused on specific skills that students should learn, and they understand the individual reading levels of their students, enabling them to serve each student more effectively. Many expressed their gratitude for inclusion in the grant, and indicated that their school has plans for widening implementation, additional training, obtaining additional books.

Focus Group Discussions

Two focus group discussion sessions were held on June 8 and 9 prior to the end of school. A total of 16 teachers and librarians attended the two sessions to discuss the implementation of the project in their schools. Focus group discussion questions focused on the implementation of the project including factors that enhanced or limited the success of the program; the staff development components; and the outcomes or results of the project. All teachers were encouraged to speak freely; therefore no individual or school was identified on audiotape or in the transcript (see Appendix E for the transcripts of the Focus Group Discussion sessions.) The following summarizes the main concepts that were expressed.

Implementation

Question: What factors enhanced the success of the LIT project implementation in your school?

The Reading Renaissance training events were key to the success of the project. The training events gave the teams the knowledge to use the reports, the reading strategies to use, and the confidence to implement the program in the schools. Another key factor identified was the involvement of the school librarian or library aide. Many librarians spent hours identifying and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

coding the library books to the AR levels, working with individual students and recommending books for them to read. Computer technology staff and the technical support offered by the ESD and by Accelerated Reader were also noted as key to success.

Question: What factors limited the success of the LIT project implementation in your school?

Three main factors were noted by those attending these focus group discussion sessions. First, was the lack of assistance or support by key staff in the building. Several participants indicated that the librarian and/or the principal was not supportive of the project; one librarian was concerned that so many books were being used and becoming worn. Some librarians refused to support the program leaving teachers to code the books themselves. In some buildings, the technology staff was overworked and unwilling to assist with the project. Getting this program ready for implementation takes people hours to identify and mark library books; in some cases parent volunteers were enlisted to assist in this process. Most noted that it is essential that the librarian be totally supportive and involved in this program; one librarian noted that she now has less time for administrative work since she is working with students to recommend books and spends more time marking books. Librarians also noted that it is important that the librarian know the curriculum well enough to recommend AR books that support the curriculum.

The second factor that limited the success of the project was the lack of enough books or book tests. The success of this project depends on having both a quantity of AR books for students to read plus having a wide range of reading levels so that all levels of students can progress at their own rate. Paperback books began wearing out and falling apart because they were being used so much. Many of the evaluation teachers began collecting classroom collections by buying books at garage sales just to keep up with the student appetite for more books. Many teachers noted that they are seeking funds for more books; staff soon realized that for this program to be successful they have to have a good selection of books and AR tests for the books they do have.

The third major factor was the technology. Schools wanting to network the software so that multiple classrooms could use it on their networks ran into technical difficulties. One school couldn't get started until March because getting the software set up on the school system took so much time. Teachers also noted that they often did not have enough computers in the classroom to accommodate their students' desire and need to take the AR tests. Especially at the early elementary level where students were reading books quickly, the need to take tests quickly couldn't be accommodated by the few computers available.

Middle school staff also expressed the concern of how to integrate this program into the curriculum constraints of a secondary school. They wished to have additional information and strategies to help them figure the issues of classroom novels, time and curriculum and how AR can be used at the secondary level.

Staff Development

Question: How did the staff development affect the implementation? Did you take on staff development support role in your building?

The project paid for training a limited number of staff in each building. The general consensus was that the quality of the training provided by the grant was outstanding. Several teachers indicated that since they were among the few personnel trained in their building, they took on a larger role in training and supporting other staff who could not attend the training. One participant noted, "I was the human 3-ring circus trying to keep people motivated. One whole grade level never got into it, and we are hoping that the students who participated will demand the program." Another librarian noted that "The enthusiasm spread like mold and mildew throughout the building>" Generally the teachers who were trained took on the role of training others how to use the program. One school committed to using SLIBG funds to train all the teachers by the end of the school year. Teachers also did presentations for their school boards and parent support groups about the program. Some indicated that the interest is so high in their schools that they are setting up training for the entire staff through the brokering with Reading Renaissance that the ESD is performing.

Impact of Project

Question: What has been the impact on students of the program?

Participants noted that primary impact has been on students reading motivation and skills. Most of the teachers had success stories that they shared where students had made incredible growth in reading ability due to the program. They noted that the dedicated time to practice reading and the strategies stressed in the training really work. Others noted that students are reading and discussing classic books, something that they have never experienced before. One said, "I haven't heard books being discussed like this—ever. Students are discussing books in the room, in the cafeteria lunchline, in the hallway." Another noted," We have a success story of a little guy who was so low, he couldn't test out on STAR. He started with really simple books and we have watched him grow. He would come up and ask if he could read his AR book to the librarian; he would give up his recess to come into the library and read his AR book." Many noted that the new student motivation is being carried over into other parts of the curriculum.

Another impact of the project noted was that it has helped teachers identify students with reading problems. Teachers noted that there were students who they thought were reading fine, but either the STAR test or the results of the AR tests showed that they were having problems. These teachers noted that they felt that these students would have fallen through the cracks if it had not been for the AR program. Another, a teacher of primary students, noted that the program is especially helpful for their higher level students who she felt they were not serving well because they were always focusing on the lower level students?

Students are reading the kinds and quality of books that they wouldn't before. Students are saying that a book moved them or made them cry. Kids are keeping lists of books they want to read next.

Question: Have you used any of the recommended incentive (reward) system and what has been the impact of those?

Teachers noted a wide range, from no incentives beyond students earning the AR points, to a wide array of prizes. Teachers discussed some of their different incentives, which included:

- Certificates for different levels.

- Gifts and reward items—often funded by parents and at least in one case anonymously donated. One teacher noted that the PTSA allocates $1200 each year for AR rewards.
- Point clubs with different rewards—one point club had as its ultimate 100-point reward a field trip to attend a play.
- Bookmarks
- Raffles—some raffles for a pop, others for 5 minutes early out of class for lunch.
- Beads and charms for major milestones.
- Student has name mentioned on intercom when they reach a higher level.
- One teacher noted that she focuses on classroom points rather than individual points in an effort to limit individual competition.

Question: Have there been unanticipated impacts of the program?

- One librarian instituted the program for staff—she notes that teachers, ed assistants, custodians, the cook and the Dare officer are all reading the same books as the students and getting their pictures up on the wall of fame with the students. It has brought together teachers and students in a way that they never have before.
- Several teachers indicated that it is helping them make a connection with the Timberland Library. The public libraries in many of the communities are asking for the AR lists since students are looking for books in the public libraries.
- One district is investigating using the STAR assessment tool in all schools for general reading assessment.
- One teacher indicated that although she has not focused on writing, since using AR, the quality of her students' writing has improved.
- Parent involvement was noted by a number of teachers who indicated that parents are noticing that their students are reading more and want to be supportive. Another established book bags that go home with the students and has helped with the parent connection to the program.
- One teacher has been using AR in her special education class and indicated that the students see their own improvement and are very proud of themselves.
- An after school program in one of the schools donated $2000 for the school to buy more AR test disks and prizes.
- A principal observing the program made a commitment to additional funds for the library book budget.
- A community foundation donated $2500 for more AR books.
- It forced one school to "get its computer act together" since so many students wanted to take AR tests.

Project Improvement

Question: How could the grant have been improved?

Most of the answers to this question had to do with issues that were beyond the control of the grant administrators, since changes in fiscal agents and the subsequent delay in obtaining software and hardware couldn't have been anticipated. Teachers noted that they would have preferred to have the first training when they had the software available in their schools. Some indicated that the team composition needed to be considered more carefully since the involvement of the librarian was critical but that the paraprofessional involvement was not has valuable as having another teacher involved in the training. Others noted that the commitment

of the school and district technology staff is important and should have been secured. Despite these comments, in general, the participants noted that this was a very easy grant to be involved with and they were very thankful to Debbie Hale and the ESD for developing the grant proposal and implementing the grant.

Appendices

Appendix A
Workshop Evaluation Form
Workshop Rating Information

LIT Workshop Evaluation Form

Workshop Title: _____ Date(s): _____

Location of Workshop: _____ Facilitator(s): _____

Program	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	4	3	2	1
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	4	3	2	1
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	4	3	2	1
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	4	3	2	1
5. Physical facilities were suitable for activities	4	3	2	1
6. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	4	3	2	1
Facilitator(s)				
7. Facilitator(s) was (were) organized and prepared	4	3	2	1
8. Facilitator(s) has a thorough knowledge of the subject.	4	3	2	1
9. Facilitator(s) used effective teaching strategies.	4	3	2	1
10. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	4	3	2	1
11. What I learned will be very useful with students.	4	3	2	1

12. What do you feel is the most important thing that you learned?

11. How will you incorporate the skills or knowledge you learned into your teaching?

12. What suggestions do you have to improve the training?

13. What topic or topics would you like to see included in the next LIT training?

Workshop Ratings

Reading Renaissance I
Date: 9/21-24/1998 (Two locations, two evenings at each location)
Location: ESD 113, Olympia; CELL Center, Aberdeen
Facilitator: Linda Borgen from Academic Excellence
Time: 6 hours for each workshop
Number of participants: 88

Program	Average Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.73
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.74
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.60
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.69
5. Physical facilities were suitable for activities	3.83
6. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.82
Facilitator(s)	
7. Facilitator(s) was (were) organized and prepared	3.91
8. Facilitator(s) has a thorough knowledge of the subject.	4.0
9. Facilitator(s) used effective teaching strategies.	3.89
10. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.56
11. What I learned will be very useful with students.	3.81

12. What do you feel is the most important thing that you learned?
The most common responses were:
How to implement the AR and STAR programs (15)
The success that students can have with reading practices (60 minutes a day concept) (9)
The strategies learned to motivate students to read more. (7)
Understanding how the reports work and how to best use the information. (4)
Other singular responses included:
Children can always learn to read no matter what level or age
A way to help every student on their reading at an individual level.
Everything
There is time, don't get frustrated; get started with your students now.
The need to prepare students--need to label books.
The possible impact this could have on an entire school.
How to start making better readers.
Examples of how to work with students knowledge and implementation to make the program successful.
Move child forward slowly from the level he is comfortable with.
How to improve the reading comprehension at all levels.

11. How will you incorporate the skills or knowledge you learned into your teaching?
The most common responses to this open-ended questions had to do with the ways teachers were going to implement the program in their schools.

Implement in their own classrooms was the most common response.(7)
Teaching or working with other staff to implement was the second most common response (6).
Other responses included:
Piloting in one class prior to schoolwide implementation. (4)
Beginning with reading records and status of the class. (4)
Getting the library set up and providing books. (4)
All teachers implementing the program (1)
Continuing what works and adding reading time (1).
A better way to assess reading and track progress of students--more organization (1)
Set up the awards system discussed. (1)
By motivating the students to like to read and practice, practice, practice--60 min./week. (1)
Using this program with special education students. (1)
Begin to monitor their reading time. (1)
Help students choose appropriate books. (1)
Motivating the students to get involved in AR (1).
Not sure yet. (1)
Don't know--have nothing (computer disks) yet (1).
Wow-where to begin. (1)

12. What suggestions do you have to improve the training?
Most respondents either did not fill out this section or indicated that they had no suggestions for improvement (5 responses). Other suggestions included:
Great job; everything was well put together; I wouldn't change a thing. (2)
To have the class immediately after school, not at 5:30. (2)
More hands-on practice. (2)
Suggest that two people come to the computer training and share a computer--one to take notes and one to use the computer. (1).
Teach all program to participants--don't separate the training. (1).
Get administrators here earlier to see the importance of their support. (1).
Give out lists of books by grade level so you don't have to hunt them down from one person. (1).
Don't worry about trying to sell the program; it does that by itself. (1).
Shorter sessions--or break them up more. (1).
Offer earlier in the week when we are a little fresher. (1).

13. What topic or topics would you like to see included in the next LIT training?
Very few responses were given to this question. Most of the responses tended to focus on the books that are used in the program:
Book title and level, more info on high low books, etc garnered 3 responses
Teachers also wanted more information on how to use the program with special populations--one wanted primary, one wanted high school, and one wanted special education information.
Two respondents wanted more computer training time.
Other singular responses included:
Just review some of the nuts and bolts of the program.
See how we began and share notes, programs and goals to continue.
More time spent on quizzes--justify them.
Troubleshooting/sharing what works and what doesn't with other schools.

More training and support the next year.
If possible have a real student or several students come and take a test so teachers could interact with a student's point of view of the program.

Workshop Title: Level 0 Training
Date: 10/28-29/98 (Two locations for this workshop)
Presenter: Jim Hill
Time: 3 hours
Number of participants: 38

Program	Average Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.44
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.33
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.39
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.44
5. Physical facilities were suitable for activities	3.11
6. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.59
Facilitator(s)	
7. Facilitator(s) was (were) organized and prepared	3.50
8. Facilitator(s) has a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.56
9. Facilitator(s) used effective teaching strategies.	3.44
10. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.67
11. What I learned will be very useful with students.	3.53

12. What do you feel is the most important thing that you learned?
The most common responses were:
How to set up and operate the iMac computer. (8)
How to use system 8.5 (1)
How to use new software (1)
Advice and written materials from librarian. (1)
How the computer is different from other machines used in the past. (1)
Practice with iMac. (1)
More at ease with iMac. (1)

11. How will you incorporate the skills or knowledge you learned into your teaching?
Almost all the responses were directly related to the district's use of the Accelerated Reader program.
Using or getting started with AR. (8)
The other comments were:
To be determined. (1)
How to instruct staff (1)

12. What suggestions do you have to improve the training?
Very few responses were given for this question. Two individuals indicated that they needed more time.

13. What topic or topics would you like to see included in the next LIT training?
Two responses indicated that they needed more information about STAR and AR, and one indicated he/she was looking forward to the second Reading Renaissance training and needed help with the students and the reading part of the program.

Workshop Title: Reading Renaissance II
Date: 1/25-26 and 1/27-28(Two locations for this workshop)
Presenter: Penny Reinart and Lisa Finley from Academic Excellence
Time: 2 days for each workshop
Number of participants:

Program	Average Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.88
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.86
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.89
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.82
5. Physical facilities were suitable for activities	3.67
6. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.92
Facilitator(s)	
7. Facilitator(s) was (were) organized and prepared	3.98
8. Facilitator(s) has a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.98
9. Facilitator(s) used effective teaching strategies.	3.97
10. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.81
11. What I learned will be very useful with students.	3.92

12. What do you feel is the most important thing that you learned?
The most common responses were:
How to implement the program (14)
Diagnosis and goal setting (8)
Duolog reading (3)
The importance of teamwork (3)
The report forms and how to read them (2)
All parts of the information (2)
How much improvement the students make if the teacher uses the materials and tests (2)

Other responses included:
Information on costs, certification, teams, at-risk reports, Duolog reading.
Just being motivated is the biggest thing.
Enthusiasm for teaching.
How AR and STAR can thread through the entire school
How important it is to read.
How to go back to my classroom and make what I'm already doing better.
Classroom management aspects of AR and RR.

How to move students along in their reading progress
Troubleshooting problem areas.
Practice reading time is the path to accomplish our goals.
The idea that reading gains are crucial to student success.
At-risk report.
Just to reaffirm the need to read in all grades, not just for academic learning.
The wealth of information shared is excellent.
That status of the class is essential when we intervene and conference with students.
No one can't read.
Fine tuning the AR program.
Realizing the need to teach children to like to read.
Pacing
The information I need to be successful; all the support that is available.
Better techniques for monitoring the program.
Gave3 me more information to enhance the program in my classroom.

11. How will you incorporate the skills or knowledge you learned into your teaching?
The most prevalent response (15) was that the participants will use the information and skills to get the program working properly in their classrooms. In addition, participants indicated that they intend to use:
Staff meetings and training to get other teachers involved (5)
Get the library up to speed to support the program (3)
Use Duolog reading (3)
Find more time for AR. (2)
Change schedule and incorporate more AR components
Use this to be supportive of the other people working with AR.
Use the skills to bring those reading challenged students up to speed.
Teach my students about the tests, reading levels and basics of the program.
Implement even more "read to".
Team with the English department.
Use peers and better use the reports.
Apply in my classroom—the status of the class and intervention and motivation.
Keep after my principal for the things I need.
I have the tools to go on my own.
By practicing.
Better tracking through goal setting and reports.
Adjust grading system to accommodate AR, use student and classroom goals.
Already implementing the skills—this workshop reinforced it and gave us a shot in the arm.
Improving with AR, status of the class.
I have short and long term goals and set timelines towards becoming a model classroom.
Assist students in book selections. Read to and discuss books in media class.

12. What suggestions do you have to improve the training?
Few participants responded to this question. The responses included:
None (6)
More hands-on on the computer with the programs—have participants read and take test (4)

Needed another day! Lots of ideas to be shared. (2)
Reinforcement sessions(2)
More K-1 information (2)
Keep coming back with more information.
Never quite knew where we were in the books.
How can you improve what already is excellent?
Would love copies of some stories/mini-lessons shared.
More interaction with group and evaluating TOPS report.
Break out sessions for elementary and high school teachers to focus on specific grade level needs types of logs to use, ways to help, etc.
Whole district needs training.
Allow more staff members to attend.
Chock full of information.

13. What topic or topics would you like to see included in the next LIT training?
Again, very few participants responded to this question. The responses were:
Accelerated Math (3)
Time for questions (2)
Would like to get Book Guide.
Sentence Master training.
Specific steps on how to make tests for a book.
More on what high schools are doing to motivate and how they do 60 minutes of practice each day.
We will have to get into this a little more -to see where we are lacking.
More mini-lessons (2), certification lists, middle school implementation.
K-1 implementation.
More high interest, low level.
If everyone is up and running, have them bring STAR, TOPS, At-risk reports and practice evaluating them.
More information on getting reports, use of computers.
More RR.
More share time with others.
More suggestions for purchasing books and tests.
More hands-on computer training. More time working diagnostic and intervention part and reading reports.
Use Marilyn Burns research to enhance research done or used by Institute of Academic Excellence.
If you haven't used her information, you will be happy to have her research backing.
A session for individual schools to work on Accelerated Reading.

Workshop Title: Overview of Sentence Master
Date: 3/8/99
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Kaaren Lahaug
Time: 3 hours
Number of participants: 16

Program	Mean Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.63

2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.63
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.75
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.83
5. Physical facilities were suitable for activities	3.63
6. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.88
Facilitator(s)	Mean Rating
7. Facilitator(s) was (were) organized and prepared	3.75
8. Facilitator(s) has a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.75
9. Facilitator(s) used effective teaching strategies.	3.88
10. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.88
11. What I learned will be very useful with students.	3.88

12. What do you feel is the most important thing that you learned?
All the responses (6) focused on the primary reason all were there—to learn how to use the software with their students. One also indicated that he/she will share the knowledge and techniques with Title 1 and Special Education staff and other teachers needing another tool for struggling readers.

11. How will you incorporate the skills or knowledge you learned into your teaching?
Two respondents indicated that they will use this program with non-readers, struggling readers or ESL students.
One respondent indicated that this will be a tool she/he will use with the first graders prior to using Accelerated Reader.

12. What suggestions do you have to improve the training?
One respondent indicated that Kaaren (Lahaug) is wonderful.

13. What topic or topics would you like to see included in the next LIT training?
Organizing and management ideas for Accelerated Reading. Recruiting volunteers.

Workshop Title: Reading Renaissance I
Date: 5/20/99
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Julianne Miller
Time: One day
Number of participants: 100

Program	Mean Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.73
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.66
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.61
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.72
5. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.79
Instructor	Mean Rating

6. Instructor was organized and prepared	3.92
7. Instructor had a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.93
8. Instructor used effective teaching strategies.	3.80
9. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.34

10. The physical facilities were suitable for activities? Yes: 82 No: 6

11. Significant ideas I learned from this program. Since this workshop was focused on the basic skills that teachers must have to use the Accelerated Reader and STAR programs, if followed the majority of responses (27) noted that learning those skills was the most significant idea. Other responses included:
Learning to deal with a variety of reading levels. (7)
Using the reports and other mechanisms to monitor or track student progress. (7)
Information about learning information systems. (5)
The idea that students need more time for reading. (4)
Ideas on motivating or rewarding students. (4)
Curriculum integration or how to incorporate AR into the existing program. (3)
Goal setting strategies. (3)
Reading information and strategies. (2)
Other comments expressed by only one participant included: "It focused me in my classroom with AR."; "Reading logs"; levels of certification; "Too numerous to mention. What a full day!"; "Reading Renaissance is just known effective reading strategies packaged up to sell."; "We need to do this"; "Training very helpful."; "Go for it!"; "Encouraged me to continue to promote AR."

12. Strengths of this program. Participants at this workshop seemed to like and respond to the presenter. The presenter's style, organization, and sense of humor were noted by 23 participants. Other responses included:
The usability of the AR/STAR programs. (7)
The assessment and reporting tools in the program. (6)
The proven success of the program. (5)
The materials and visuals used in the presentation. (4)
Comments by one participant were: "Improvement and familiarity."; "Good overview of the program."; "Nice shot in the arm to get AR program to another level."; "Built on what I knew. I'm more willing and confident to go back to my class, label my books and begin."; it is researched based; communication with parents; can be used for various grades and subjects; how to improve comprehension, goal setting.

13. Suggestions for improvement. Few responses were given to this question. The most common answer (5) was "None", followed by:
More time for interaction/discussion. (3)
Fewer people (2)
More time/days (2)
Two participants(2) indicated that they thought the class was advertised incorrectly—one thinking that this class seemed to be designed for experienced users, and one indicated that this should be billed as an introductory workshop not recommended for those already using the program.
Other responses by single participants were:

"Maybe team teach for variety? Sure seems like a huge responsibility."
"Stop 20 minutes earlier."
"Better coffee."
"More towards implementing and motivating—less on nuts and bolts of AR."
"More classroom examples."
"The technical equipment needs to be working for the presentation."

14. I will be able to apply the workshop content in my current job assignment. Yes: 75 No: 0 Maybe: 1

15. Other comments: Participants commented most often on the effectiveness of the workshop. Fourteen (14) respondents indicated that they thought the workshop was great. In addition, respondents noted:
"I'm excited"
"It was informative."
"I loved the lilacs and great treats—nice touch."
"I need to go to a hands-on workshop to learn how to use the materials."
"Thanks, ESD for bringing these things to us."
Not all the comments were positive, however:
"We should be able to ask questions."
"Entertaining, but not certain I learned a lot."
"Some information was covered in another AR workshop."

Workshop Title: Accelerated Reader Hands-On
Date: 5/21/99 (two sessions—morning and afternoon)
Location: ESD 113
Presenter: Julianne Miller
Time: 3 hours for each session
Number of participants: 43

Program	Mean Rating
1. Program had adequate, clearly identifiable goals	3.55
2. Program met my expectations in terms of its stated goals	3.46
3. Content was appropriate for the amount of time allowed	3.41
4. Assignments were appropriate (when applicable).	3.66
5. Written materials were of high quality and suitable for the program.	3.73
Instructor	Mean Rating
6. Instructor was organized and prepared	3.78
7. Instructor had a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.88
8. Instructor used effective teaching strategies.	3.76
9. There was an opportunity for interaction among participants.	3.63

10. The physical facilities were suitable for activities? Yes: 36 No: 4 (Those responding No found the room too cold.)

11. Significant ideas I learned from this program.
The most common answer (11) was that the most significant thing learned was how to set up and use the AR program. Two (2) individuals thought it was a good beginning session and another two thought learning to manage the technical aspects of the program was the most significant thing learned. Other comments noted were:"Hands-on use of computers"; "I will use the program."; "Generating reports"; "No real new information—just a more positive feeling to get started."; "Some secrets to the program."; "Networking options and their effects on staff and students."; "My experience was pretty limited, so I learned plenty to keep me busy."; "Book Guide"; "My desktop had all scores deleted so it was (difficult)."

12. Strengths of this program
The participants liked the hands-on nature of this training. Twelve (12) respondents indicated that the access to computers for hands-on practice was the primary strength of this training. Four (4) noted the style of the presenter, and two (2) noted that the presentation was realistic in presentation of the program and of reading growth. Other responses were: "Meeting the needs of all at a variety of technology levels."; "To increase reading program."; "Introduced me to software."; "Clear, useful materials to use in implementing the program."; "Visual and personal help."

13. Suggestions for improvement
Few responded to this section of the evaluation. Four (4) said no improvements are necessary. Three (3) indicated that they would like more time, and another three (3) indicated that they were lost or had problems because they had not attended the basic introductory session the day before. One of those three commented, "If yesterday's material is going to be repeatedly referenced, it should be a required pre-requisite." One respondent indicated: "Maybe teach the course of a higher level—a bit of "talking down" occurred." Another noted a need for climate control in the room, and one indicated that the instructor was using a different platform than the participants, which made it difficult. That participant also noted that it should have been described as a 3-hour workshop vs. a full day.

14. I will be able to apply the workshop content in my current job assignment. Yes: 36 No: 0

15. Other comments: Again, few participants responded to this question. Four(4) indicated that it was an enjoyable presentation and the presenter was dynamic and personable. One indicated that the previous day's session should have been required prior to the hands-on session. And one said, "As the librarian, I have a great responsibility to keep teachers on track and students motivated."

Appendix B
Student Attitude Surveys

LIT Student Survey
Fall, 1998

Make an X in the appropriate box indicating whether or not you agree with each statement.

	YES!	Yes	????	No	NO!
1. I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.					
2. I have favorite books and authors.					
3. I'm not good at reading.					
4. Reading is important in school.					
5. I choose reading over watching TV.					
6. I read just for fun.					
7. It's easy for me to read.					
8. I read everyday at home.					
9. I like going to the library and selecting books to read.					
10. Reading is NOT one of my favorite activities.					
11. I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).					
12. like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.					
13. I wish I had more time to read.					
14. I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.					
15. Reading helps me be a better writer.					
16. I think reading is hard work.					

	Daily	Once a Week	Once a Month	Maybe once a year	Never
17. I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.					
18. I go to the public library.					
19. I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.					

20. I read email messages or Web page information.					

Name:_____

School: _____

Teacher: _____

LIT Student Survey

Spring, 1999

Make an X in the appropriate box indicating whether or not you agree with each statement.

	YES!	Yes	Maybe	No	NO!
1. I enjoy reading. It's a lot of fun.					
2. I have favorite books and authors.					
3. I'm NOT a good reader.					
4. Reading is important in school.					
5. I choose reading over watching TV.					
6. I read just for fun.					
7. I like reading Accelerated Reader Books.					
8. It's easy for me to read.					
9. I read everyday at home.					
10. I like going to the library and selecting books to read.					
11. I DON"T like to read.					
12. I like earning Accelerated Reader points.					
13. 11. I like reading certain kinds of books (mystery, adventure, romance, horror, suspense, etc.).					
14. 12. I like to talk about the books I have read with my friends or parents.					
15. I wish I had more time to read.					
16. 14. I can imagine the people, places and events when I read a book.					
17. Accelerated Reader helps me to be a better reader.					
18. Reading helps me be a better writer.					
19. I think reading is hard work.					

	Daily	Once a Week	Once a Month	Maybe once a year	Never
20. I read books, magazines or newspapers at home.					
21. I go to the public library.					
22. I talk to my parents or friends about things I have read.					

Name:_____ _____

School: _____

Teacher: _____

Appendix C
Classroom Student Data Collected

Classroom Data

School	District	Evaluation Teacher	Grade Level	Pre Student Survey	Post Student Survey	Pre Teacher Survey	Post Teacher Survey	Pre STAR data	Post STAR Data	Post AR data	NCE change	PR change	Mean AR Points	Minutes per day
A J. West Elementary	Aberdeen	Pete Robirds	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-1.93	-2.83	18.58	No data
Alexander Young Elementary	Aberdeen	Bonnie Gilovich	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-3.95	-6.38	35.03	60
Central Park Elementary	Aberdeen	Connie Chicano	2/3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+1.89	+2.91	10.39	45
Harbor High School	Aberdeen	Anne Jones	9-12 (spec. ed)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+6.98	+11.25	No data	30
McDermoth Elementary	Aberdeen	Jan Morgan	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+2.75	+4.29	27.33	60
Miller Jr. High School	Aberdeen	Marcia Lewis	7	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	+1.97	+1.52	47.42	No data
Robert Gray Elementary	Aberdeen	Janice Williams	2/3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-1.64	-1.71	18.39	45
Stevens Elementary	Aberdeen	Lisa Sharma	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-2.66	-3.13	7.86	20
Weatherwax High School	Aberdeen			No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Washington Elementary School	Hoquaim	Karen Ellingson	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Central Elementary	Hoquiam	Cathy Deschenes	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+2.02	+2.75	9.27	30-40
Central Elementary	Hoquiam	Randy Manley	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+5.56	+8.62	44.17	60
Emerson Elementary	Hoquiam	Erika Harmer	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+8.68	+13.74	5.60	30
Emerson Elementary	Hoquiam	Ms. Mitchell	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+8.85	+13.58	5.38	30-40
Hoquiam High School	Hoquiam	Mike Pirianian	9	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	+2.51	+5.22	19.93	No data
Hoquiam Middle School	Hoquiam	Jan Walberg	7/8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+0.12	+0.63	3.16	No data
Lincoln Elementary	Hoquiam	Marie Wetzel	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No data	No data	No data	
Beacon Avenue Elementary	Montesano	Sheryl Nelson	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	+1.06	+0.38	11.13	30
Montesano High School	Montesano	Mrs. Narrance	8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data

Simpson Avenue Elementary	Montesano	Kathy McGuire	1/2/3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	+0.40	+0.95	No data	No data
Napavine Elementary	Napavine	Michele Harvey	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+2.05	+2.73	58.11	60
Meadows Elementary	North Thurston	Anna Mccourt/Cindy Johnson	1/2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+5.05	+7.94	22.36	45-60
Meadows Elementary	North Thurston	Gail Martin	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+4.12	+4.84	57.77	30
Meadows Elementary	North Thurston	Mary Holmberg	5/6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-0.19	-0.46	123.52	10-20
Ocosta Elementary	Ocosta	Jessica Ably	6	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Ocosta High School	Ocosta	Victor Garcia	7/8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Pioneer Middle School	Pioneer	Kim Matthews	7 (spec ed)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+4.46	+5.28	19.73	No data
Pioneer Primary	Pioneer	Laurie McGovern	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-3.23	-3.33	10.17	75
Rainer Elementary	Rainier	Roger Pitts	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+0.31	-1.80	1.01	50
Rainier High School	Rainier			No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Grand Mound Elementary	Rochester	Theresa Kelly-Brooks	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+10.56	+5.58	45.08	45-60
Rochester Primary	Rochester	Mrs Simmons	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	+0.26	+2.60	11.10	45-60

Appendix D
Teacher Survey Forms
Teacher Survey Results.

LIT Teacher Survey
Fall, 1998

	YES!	Yes	Not Sure	No	NO!
1. Students in my class have opportunities to read a wide variety of fiction and non-fiction.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My students use journals and other means to write about literature	1	2	3	4	5
3. I integrate reading skills across my curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My reading groups are defined by interest not ability.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Students self select the books they read in my reading program.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I schedule daily time for independent sustained student reading.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The core of my reading program is a basal reader.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have students use journals and other writing assignments to develop their reading comprehension and analysis skills.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I supplement a basal reading program with literature.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I use information about my students' reading levels to tailor my instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I place students in reading groups based on ability.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My students discuss commonly read literature in cooperative groups.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I am able to access and use information regarding my students reading comprehension abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I vary my teaching strategies to accommodate my students' learning styles.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My students practice reading at their instructional level.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I have adequate information about my students' instructional reading level.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I need additional strategies to motivate students to read independently.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I employ various strategies to assist students in communicating what they have learned and experienced from their reading.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I use strategies to involve parents in their children's reading	1	2	3	4	5

20. What do you want to accomplish in your classroom through the addition of the Accelerated Reader and STAR programs?

21. What strategies do you currently employ in motivating students to read independently?

22. What strategies do you currently employ to assist students in communicating what they have learned or experienced from their reading?

23. What are the issues you face in your classroom/school/community regarding ensuring that all students can meet the Reading EALRS?

Fall Teacher Survey Results

The following chart shows how the teachers rated their practices and the average ratings, using the scale of 1 (YES!) to 5 (No!). Teachers

	YES!	Yes	Not Sure	No	NO!	Mean
1. Students in my class have opportunities to read a wide variety of fiction and non-fiction.	12	13	1	3	0	2.50
2. My students use journals and other means to write about literature	4	18	2	4	2	2.40
3. I integrate reading skills across my curriculum.	10	16	2	0	0	1.71
4. My reading groups are defined by interest not ability.	4	2	1	12	7	3.62
5. Students self select the books they read in my reading program.	6	9	2	5	3	2.60
6. I schedule daily time for independent sustained student reading.	13	10	1	5	1	2.03
7. The core of my reading program is a basal reader.	4	11	0	13	2	2.93
8. I have students use journals and other writing assignments to develop their reading comprehension and analysis skills.	3	20	2	4	0	2.24
9. I supplement a basal reading program with literature.	11	11	0	7	1	2.20
10. I use information about my students' reading levels to tailor my instruction.	10	16	2	2	0	1.87
11. I place students in reading groups based on ability.	4	6	2	10	3	3.10
12. My students discuss commonly read literature in cooperative groups.	1	8	4	16	1	3.27
13. I am able to access and use information regarding my students reading comprehension abilities.	6	13	3	8	0	2.43
14. I vary my teaching strategies to accommodate my students' learning styles.	8	19	2	1	0	1.87
15. My students practice reading at their instructional level.	8	14	4	4	0	2.13
16. I have adequate information about my students' instructional reading level.	3	9	5	11	2	3.00
17. I need additional strategies to motivate students to read independently.	12	12	4	1	0	1.79
18. I employ various strategies to assist students in communicating what they have learned and experienced from their reading.	5	18	6	1	0	2.10
19. I use strategies to involve parents in their children's reading	3	17	2	8	0	2.50

20. What do you want to accomplish in your classroom through the addition of the Accelerated Reader and STAR programs?

Teachers participating in this project have admirable goals for the use of these programs in their classrooms. The most common responses to this question were:

Wanting to get their students excited about or instill in them a love of reading (12)
Increase students' reading comprehension (9)
Increase their own knowledge of their students' reading levels (9)
Guide students to choose books that are appropriate for them (8)
Increase their students' confidence and self esteem (4)
More reading (4)
Increase students' reading of high quality authors and "real" literature (3)
Improving the students vocabulary (2)
Get students in the habit of reading (2)
Create student higher interest and lower frustration level with reading (2)
Increase fluency (2)
Better way of making reading library books accountable (2)

Other responses were:

Self choice of books
Students more willing to choose reading (over other activities)
Integrate technology
Improve classroom reading skills
Improve CTBS scores
Identify lower students for help.
Help me better guide students.
Help tailor reading experiences.
Better student understanding of genre
Better student understanding of his or her own strengths and weaknesses
Better readers—those who can tell about what they read
Use more class time for personal reading

21. What strategies do you currently employ in motivating students to read independently?
Teachers identified a number of strategies they already employ to help their students read independently. Among them were:
Book-It (10),
SSR (8)
Making books available in class (5)
Library time (4)
Reading to students (4)
Home reading programs (4)
Free reading time (4)
Talking about books and authors (3)
AR (2)
Drop Everything and Read Program (2)
Get Caught Reading (2)
Modeling love of reading (2)
Rewards (2)

Teachers also noted other wide varieties of strategies such as audio tape/book sets, students recommending books, students summarizing books, asking students about SSR books, computer time, giving books at their level, positive atmosphere, booktalks from librarian, grade points, extra credit, supporting basal reader with literature, Independent reading center, listening centers, Balanced Reading, status of class, goal setting, reading books at their level, partner reading, exposing students to a wide variety of literature, reading roster, grades, definitions, discussions about books, book reports, independent homework reading.

22. What strategies do you currently employ to assist students in communicating what they have learned or experienced from their reading?
Teachers most often listed journal writing (10) and class or group discussion (10) as the most common communications strategies. Teachers also are employing:
Writing assignments based on reading (6)
Oral sharing (6)

Oral and written book reports (6)
Questions (3)
Summaries of SSR books (2)
Book related projects (2)
Booktalk (2)
Other singular answers included: students read to class, answer comprehension stories, reader's chair, bookmaking, storyline sketches, group projects, impromptu speeches, extension activities, AR tests, advanced organizers, share writing, designing book covers, making books on tape, essay quizzes, student made quizzes, home reading assignments, workbooks/worksheets, status of class, Reading Renaissance idea rather than journals, art projects, reading rosters, Author talks, papers, story webs, Venn diagrams.

23. What are the issues you face in your classroom/school/community regarding ensuring that all students can meet the Reading EALRS?
Teachers participating in this project cite a number of issues that they are facing in their classrooms in raising their students reading levels to higher standards. Most common answers were:
The lack of parental interest and support for reading (8)
The many different levels of their students (7)
Limited time (4)
ESL students (3)
Lack of readiness skills (2)
Reduced instructional aide assistance (2)
Home environment (2)

Teachers also noted the following:
Transciency rates, community diversity, low income, split grade class needs, lack of classroom volunteers, the pressure to make every student a high achieving reader by 2nd grade, starting the reading tutor program, training for staff and parents, student absences, increasing reading skill, poor curriculum, getting teachers to give up time to AR, not enough books, money to employ library help, more opportunities to read, write and relate, severe emotional and behavior problems, too many things to work on, additional classroom help, time for communicating with parents and planning, materials across the abilities, support for SSR, lack of funding and support, lack of reading outside of school, worry about the students ability to compare, contrast, summarize and cite passages.

LIT Teacher Survey
April 1999

Name_____

School_____

Please answer the question below regarding your experiences implementing the LIT Project (Accelerated Reader, STAR, and Sentence Master).

	YES!	Yes	Not Sure	No	NO!
• Students in my class have more opportunities to read a wide variety of fiction and non-fiction with AR.	1	2	3	4	5
• My students use journals and other means to write about literature	1	2	3	4	5
• I am better able to integrate reading skills across my curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
• My reading groups are defined by interest not ability.	1	2	3	4	5
• Students self-select appropriate level books in my reading program.	1	2	3	4	5
• I am able to schedule adequate daily time for reading TWI.	1	2	3	4	5
• The core of my reading program is still a basal reader.	1	2	3	4	5
• I have increased my techniques to develop student reading comprehension and analysis skills.	1	2	3	4	5
• I now use AR to supplement a basal reading.	1	2	3	4	5
• I am better able to use information about my students' reading levels to tailor my instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
• I place students in reading groups based on ability.	1	2	3	4	5
• My students discuss commonly read literature in cooperative groups.	1	2	3	4	5
• I am better able to access and use information regarding my students reading comprehension abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
• I have more ways to vary my teaching strategies in order to accommodate my students' learning styles.	1	2	3	4	5
• My students now practice reading at their instructional level.	1	2	3	4	5
• I have adequate information about my students' instructional reading level.	1	2	3	4	5
• I have learned additional strategies to motivate students to read independently.	1	2	3	4	5
• I employ various strategies to assist students in communicating what they have learned and experienced from their reading.	1	2	3	4	5
• I have new strategies to involve parents in their children's reading.	1	2	3	4	5

Educational Technology Consulting
Olympia, Washington

- How many months have you been using AR?
- How many minutes per day are your students reading (TWI)?
- How many other teachers in your school are implementing the program?
- What other Reading Renaissance strategies have you been able to implement?
- What other reading programs or strategies are you using?
- Has your library circulation increased (give specific percentage of increase if possible)?
- How much staff time (technical support, labeling library books, classroom management and design time) has been devoted to getting the program "up and running" in your school?
- What impact have you seen on students' interest and motivation in reading? (Please give some anecdotal information if possible)
- Has the staff development provided through the project helped you implement the program? How?
- Has the program had any effect on parental involvement in their student's reading?
- Are there any other benefits that you have experienced as a result of this project?
- Do you have any other comments regarding the LIT grant project?

Spring Teacher Survey Results

	YES! 1	Yes 2	Not Sure3	No 4	NO! 5	Mean
• Students in my class have more opportunities to read a wide variety of fiction and non-fiction with AR.	12	10	0	1	0	1.57
• My students use journals and other means to write about literature	2	8	0	11	2	3.13
• I am better able to integrate reading skills across my curriculum.	7	13	3	0	0	1.83
• My reading groups are defined by interest not ability.	2	5	5	5	3	2.82
• Students self-select appropriate level books in my reading program.	14	7	0	1	0	1.45
• I am able to schedule adequate daily time for reading TWI.	10	10	0	1	2	1.91
• The core of my reading program is still a basal reader.	4	8	3	5	3	1.78
• I have increased my techniques to develop student reading comprehension and analysis skills.	5	14	4	0	0	1.96
• I now use AR to supplement a basal reading.	13	6	0	4	0	1.78
• I am better able to use information about my students' reading levels to tailor my instruction.	8	14	1	0	0	1.70
• I place students in reading groups based on ability.	3	3	5	5	4	3.05
• My students discuss commonly read literature in cooperative groups.	4	9	1	9	0	2.65
• I am better able to access and use information regarding my students reading comprehension abilities.	10	11	2	0	0	1.65
• I have more ways to vary my teaching strategies in order to accommodate my students' learning styles.	5	17	0	1	0	1.87
• My students now practice reading at their instructional level.	14	9	0	0	0	1.39
• I have adequate information about my students' instructional reading level.	12	10	1	0	0	1.52
• I have learned additional strategies to motivate students to read independently.	7	16	0	0	0	1.70
• I employ various strategies to assist students in communicating what they have learned and experienced from their reading.	6	10	4	2	0	2.09
• I have new strategies to involve parents in their children's reading.	6	11	4	2	0	2.09

- How many months have you been using AR?

Several teachers answering the questionnaire failed to answer this question due in part to its placement on the page. Four (4) teachers indicated that they have been using the program for 10 months or more (at least one full school year). Three of those were teachers in Meadows Elementary where all the teachers use the Accelerated Reader program. The other was a librarian whose use of the program has mostly been primarily limited to getting the books in the library ready for use.

Eight(8) teachers indicate they have been using the program between 4 and 9 months. Two teachers indicated they have been using Accelerated Reader for only one or two months.

- How many minutes per day are your students reading (TWI)?

One of the most stressed Reading Renaissance strategies is that of 60 minutes per day for the students to be read to, read with or read independently. This practice is key to the success of the AR program. The following shows how much time teachers responding to the survey were able to devote to reading per day:

Minutes per day	Number of teachers reporting

75	1
60	7
40-60	5
45	2
30-40	6
20	1
10-20	1
0	1

- How many other teachers in your school are implementing the program?

Five teachers indicated that all teachers in their school are using the AR program. Three of those were from Meadows Elementary, which has been using AR for a number of years. Four teachers indicated that between 10-13 other teachers in their schools are using the program. Six indicated that between 5-9 other teachers are using the program. One indicated three other teachers are using the program; one said two others are using it and three said only one other teacher is using the program. Three noted that no other teachers are using the program. One indicated that five others will be using the program next school year.

- What other Reading Renaissance strategies have you been able to implement?

Teachers answering the survey noted using the following strategies:
Duolog reading (9)
Reading logs (5)
Mini-lessons (5)
Incentives for students (rewards) (3)
TWI (2)
Group reading (2)
Goal setting (2)
The following received one response each: parent reports; STAR tests; RMS; MIMI; certificates; status of the class; book talks; practice.

- What other reading programs or strategies are you using?

Teachers most often named the reading text or curriculum program they use in their building. Answers to this question included:
Open Court (8)
Silver Burdette (2)—Castles of Sand for vocabulary and skills development
Voyager series
Scholastic Reading and Writing Connections
McMillan McGraw Hill "Spotlight on Literature"
Scribner Reading Program
Hougfhton-Mifflin Literary reading
Reading computer program (CCC)

Teachers also noted the following techniques:
LAP pull out with reading specialist
Basal reading for skills and comprehension. (3)
Language arts class novels read together (2)

Literature lessons in English text.
Reading aloud to students (2)
Reading comprehension books
Meaning driven model—thematic approach. (2)
Various programs in combination to create a balanced reading program.
Librarian reads to students once a week.
At-home reading is increased.
A lot of discussion about each story.
Three readings of each selection.

- Has your library circulation increased (give specific percentage of increase if possible)?

Many of the teachers (11) filling out the survey noted that the library circulation has increased, but did not give any specific figures. Two teachers indicated that the circulation has not increased or not yet increased.
Other comments were:
She (librarian) can't keep the books on the shelves—circulation has more than doubled.
Increased 100% plus.
Our librarian-aide has been a big help—she notes a rise of about 1/3 more.
From 949 per week to 11,000 per week---1000%
Yes, students are not only reading for AR, but the circulation for recreational reading has increased. School year 97-98: 5790 books circulated; school year 98-99: 7215 books circulated--25% increase.
AR books are separate from library books.
I'm the librarian, but cannot give specifics. My students are reading more purposely.
I checked out 10 books per reading level to add to my own library, then returned and got 10 more per level.
Yes, about 3-4 times

- How much staff time (technical support, labeling library books, classroom management and design time) has been devoted to getting the program "up and running" in your school?

Teachers indicated that quite a bit of staff time, either teachers' or librarians' or both were devoted in getting the program up and running. The responses given to this question included:
"The Title 1 teacher and computer tech got the program up and running. The librarian labeled books. I'm not sure of the time but know that the labeling took a long time."
"Days and evenings plus evenings."
"We have implemented the program mostly on our own time. Many teachers (5) will take the AR training in May."
"Two full school days."
"400+ hours"
"Library has spent more time."
"People before school and lunches and in a spot during specialist rotation."
"2-3 days"
"Several hours in classroom, many librarian hours--but worth every minute. Identify library books that were AR--4 to 5 hour--this was a volunteer parent. Labeling books--30-40 hours. This includes color-coding and placing the reading level and points on each flyleaf. Assisting students and staff to begin AR 1-12 hours. Ordering new books to match test list 4-5 hours."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"The entire school has not started to implement yet—those who are involved have spent approximately 175 hours."
"One hour per day."
"I did what got done lst year--this year even with additional test, just ran lists for students. We managed. Maybe I'll get aide time this summer to get further along."
"15-20 hours or more."
"Over 200 hours."
"Personally 40+ hours; many more for librarian and other staff."
"Librarian and computer teachers have put in unmeasurable extra hours; parent volunteers have assisted with many hours."
"Librarian aide has volunteered hours beyond her workday. Also given approximately 20 SLIBH hours."
"Our librarian has really had to put in extra hours."
"Two school days, but needed more."
"400+ hours."
Two teachers indicated that they weren't sure.
One person said, "Not much."

- What impact have you seen on students' interest and motivation in reading? (Please give some anecdotal information if possible)

Many teachers indicated that the AR program has had a great impact on student motivation to read.
Most common answers included:
Students are motivated to read more—often are reading during recess and other time. (12)
Students are sharing books they read with others. (3)
Some students are not motivated by AR (3).
Students are excited to take the tests. (2)
Students want to read challenging or quality books. (2)
There is a huge impact on reluctant or frustrated readers. (2)
Student skills in comprehension and reading levels are improving. (2)

Other teachers noted that:
There are more books being read.
Students are motivated to get points or rewards.
AR is internally motivating.
Students want to improve their reading levels.
Students are reading a wide variety of genres.
There are very few behavioral/off-task problems.
Students form small groups to read the same book.
Students motivate each other.
There is a positive impact on parent involvement.

- Has the staff development provided through the project helped you implement the program? How?

Most of the respondents indicated that the staff development was an important part of the project. Only one respondent indicated that it was somewhat important, and one said it was not important. In response to the question of how it assisted, the most common answers were:

It gave lots of specific implementation ideas. (4)
Reading log was helpful. (2)
Debbie Kilcup was knowledgeable and helpful. (2)
Our teachers want more training. (2)
Would have been lost without it. (2)
Other responses included: Learning to use the reports; how to implement the program for optimal results; the training sessions were spaced well and answered all the questions we had; goal setting was important; it was a great motivator; it helped to get other teachers in our building enthused; enabled me to conduct building inservice; gave me encouragement; and the enthusiasm of the presenters helped. One respondent indicated that she didn't have time to attend.

- Has the program had any effect on parental involvement in their student's reading?

The perceived impact on parent involvement was positive. Fourteen (14) teachers indicated that there has been a positive impact. However 4 indicated that there has been none, and three indicated that the uninvolved parents are still uninvolved. One teacher indicated that he didn't know if there had been any impact. Some examples of positive impact include:
"Parents have seen the interest at home and are more involved in books being read and progress on tests."
"Thirteen members of my class and their parents gave a testimonial presentation to our School Board. I have had many parents go out of their way to tell me of kids motivation to read at home."
"Yes, my parents are showing more interest in reading. Some are requesting lists so they can buy their children books."
"Yes, parents want to support their kids efforts. They ask for the reading logs."
"Yes, the reports give weekly updates. There are more questions about their student's progress. We will be organizing parent/student reading nights next year with one or two nights for each grade during the year."
"Two parents are really involved in their child's reading and goals."
"Parents are finding more time for kids to read."
"Our local parents group has funded more books and awards."
"Yes. They look for the TOPS reports and reward good scores."
Yes, at home reading time increased."
"Parents are asking about the program. They're curious about how it works and what the points are about."

- Are there any other benefits that you have experienced as a result of this project?

Many of the other benefits that teachers noted had to do with the students' excitement about the program, as seen through their talking about books, sharing books and setting reading goals for themselves. Most common responses were:
Kids are excited. (2
Kids are talking about the books they've read.
Kids have never been so willing to read library books on their own.
I'm excited because my kids are!
Good attitudes about wanting to read.
Students feel a sense of accomplishment.
Love of reading.
Reading rate and fluency are increasing.

I have read many wonderful books.
A great shift to independent reading as well as chapter reading among my 2nd graders.
Every student who is reading and using AR is becoming a life-long learning and understands the process of accessing information.
Providing time for the kids to just read has greatly improved comprehension and fluency for some of my lower readers and ESL kids.
I have gotten to share more literature with my students. It has given me confidence about approaching reading improvement with my students.
Increased interest in reading; greater appreciation of literature; higher level thinkers.
Reading has improved in other subjects; there is more interest in the newspaper.
I have focused more clearly on specific skills for mini-lesson teacher. I am much clearer as to the level of my students.
Children seem "high" on their reading success. They can see their growth.
Children are enthusiastic and AR blends well with our Open Court curriculum.
Community involvement with incentives, school board and administrative backing and support.

- Do you have any other comments regarding the LIT grant project?

Most of the open comments were positive. This is what the teachers had to say:
"It has been wonderful. Silent reading and my oral reading has become so much more exciting for the students.,"
"Looking forward to the session where we can share and ask questions now that the program is up and running."
"It is the most wonderful program I have ever been a part of. It has taught me so much about reading."
"Thanks"
"We need a follow-up session in late summer."
"We need a way to make the computer lab accessible to students throughout the day. It would be wonderful to have the lab staffed for more hours of the day."
"This program has been a very worthwhile and positive program for my students. They enjoy reading, it has shifted their attitudes. The computer test is a big plus and I appreciate the information in the reports. I look forward to using goal setting ideas next year and becoming a model classroom."
"The grant was very easy to implement. I tried getting on the website to add comments and successes, but could not access the page. As of May 20, 1999, 1543 tests were taken and 1393 tests were passed. Teachers are labeling their classroom libraries to coordinate with the library labels."
"This has been a great opportunity for my classroom!"
"Without books available and limited tests, the time it takes to get the program up and running--it won't be until next year before we start to see real results."
"Thanks--I know it's been a headache to you as a statistician and to Debbie Hale as coordinator, but it is a very helpful developmental piece for our students. I am thrilled to see that our building will get into it even more next year."
"We need additional support or staff to really get this program on its feet. With 25-27 IEP students and 1 para-educator trying to carry out another grant program it has been difficult to get the program going."

"Thank you. I really never believed my students would sit and read for 60 minutes a day--they are also able to set goals and help with the technology aspects of the program."
"Money for schools to work on increasing student skills is spent well when it has accompanying training opportunities. Staying focused on specific skill areas is productive."
"I'm sorry that we got on board so late. Central has benefited greatly from the STAR testing and start up tests and 2 computers! What a precious give you have given us."
"I do not necessarily provide my program with the above questions (1-19) because of the AR. I team teach a multi-age classroom so we use AR to challenge and provide additional support."
"I love it!!"
"This program works!!! I have seen the results, heard oral reading improve as well and seen better overall comprehension in the classroom."

Appendix E
Focus Group Discussion Questions
Focus Group Discussion Transcripts

Focus Group Discussion Questions:

Implementation

7. What factors enhanced the success of the LIT implementation in your school?
8. What factors limited the success of the LIT implementation in your school?
9. Was the technology (hardware and software) easy to use? Did the information management component (database) help you and your students?
10. Do you have plans for further implementation in your school?
11. How could similar grant implementation be improved?

Staff Development

- How did the staff development efforts change your reading instruction?
- Did the project have an impact on your professional growth? Do you have plans for continuing your professional development in this area?
- Have you been providing any leadership and training to the other staff in your school?
- Are you planning to train other staff members?
- Did the project create any additional needs for staff support?

Outcomes or Results

1. What has been the impact of AR?
2. What has been the impact of Sentence Master?
3. What has been the reaction of other staff, administrators, and parents to the activities of the project?
4. Has this grant sparked any unanticipated impact? Any other efforts in your school?
5. Will you continue to use Accelerated Reader (and Sentence Master) without grant support?
6. Do you have any plans for further implementation?
7. Did you use any of the external incentive programs? Please describe. How did that affect student motivation?
8. Have you sought funding from other sources to continue or expand AR?

LIT Focus Group Discussion
6/8/99
ESD 113
Four participants

Implementation
Factors that made it happen or not happen.
I will take 99% of the credit for this happening at my school. My principal did nothing. It was a sense of benign neglect. I put in personally 30-40 hours in addition doing this. We had the world's worst time getting up and running. We took the STAR test in November, but AR was not ready until January. Antiquated computers and network systems. We had one set of disks that were bad. It was a nightmare for the tech person. I was the human 3-ring circus trying to keep people motivated, trying to keep the computers working. Just get the kids ready to go and the computers would go down. One whole grade level never got into it. We are hoping that the students who participated will demand the program.. Reading Renaissance training was excellent. Would like to get site training. Worst thing is the waves of motivation with the teachers. The thing that they must experience it for themselves is that once the kids get a feel for it, the program takes on a life of its own. Some of my more reluctant colleagues have found that the program will keep going. 10 other teachers 375 students have taken tests—6,500 tests .

We don't have any books in the library. That one time $$ that we got—ten of the staff used it to get more disks. We now have more tests. This was the big problem with 5th grade—the original disks didn't have many books at their level.

That's what we found with the upper level—some of the good readers have trouble because there weren't enough tests to support the higher level readers. I couldn't get the majority of my classes to do the programs because there wasn't enough choice for them.

With us, I have marked the books along with 2 volunteer parents. My problem is that we have a group of high level readers. We are a k-3 building and we have some high level readers who are independent reader but we don't have enough books. Now the teachers have the classroom monies (enhancement monies) but they aren't spending it. They are asking me (librarian) if I would like to have that money to buy books.

I think the classics—I now have 5 copies of Little Women because it's always gone. The kids like quality literature. The research says that good readers read certain authors, and that's what's a happening. I have kids coming to me and asking if we can order a book.. The problem for me, which is a wonderful problem to have, is that my circulation is so huge that it's almost impossible to deal with . We circulated 11,000 books this last month. You know how librarians can tell if they've been read or not"

Ours just go to the book truck, they don't even go to the shelves because we are so busy. At the end of last year we had circulated only 5000 books, this year we have already circulated 7,000 books—a 25% increase in circulation It's a manpower issue. But they are reading better things. Had to shut down AR tests by June 3 so everything could get processed; there was a little boy

crying in the hall because he couldn't take his AR test—can you imagine a kid crying because he couldn't take his test?

We are trying to figure out how to get it going for the summer
We have done it for the past 3 summers.
My reserve list is huge.
Once the kids get the hang of taking the tests, it's not an issue, they just come in a do it. Only my kindergartners are assisted at this point.
Our library of was 6,000 this year.
(Discussion of books in library and circulation numbers.)

Database use ease
My staff has become really dependent. I always run reports weekly for everybody. Staff wants that data. It's going home on progress reports, in their journals, etc. They send home a list of all books read by student at conference time (2 times a year).

It just makes it difficult to print all that information—we have one printer that the whole school uses.

All of our staff prints out own reports, most have had no trouble, but I would have to say that I have been the person at our school who has done 90% of the work except for the librarian. In terms of motivating and getting other people involved, I have taken that role. Installing things. Prep time? What prep time? I haven't kept track of how many hours or anything, but it has been innumerable hours in fielding questions and giving help to staff. One thing in implementing was that we really needed a server that was dedicated to AR. We had some problems with traffic on the server.

Our server for AR has a few other things on it, but isn't the school server. It is only for the lab and the library.

In our school, the kids are taking tests in their own classroom.

In our school the 2 iMacs are in the 2nd grade classroom this year, but next year will be designated as AR computers in the commons area. I also have 2 machines in the library with AR. The students come into the library and the second graders monitor themselves. When these students move up into third grade, they will be very good teachers for those who haven't had AR in their classrooms yet.

There are two things that are pretty impressive e. The teachers are reading books and taking tests and are becoming competitive with each other. Not only teachers, but also ed assistants, our Dare officer, the custodian, the cook. I don't make them do on their reading level. Kids and staff are making the connection that they haven't before. I put the staff pictures up on the readers' wall of fame too. The other thing that doesn't show on any report is attitude towards reading. I have been in the school for 7 years, I see kids with problems starting to take the risk and started to go up. One little 5th grader has struggled all of his life, and now he is one of my top point earners. There's that attitude and self esteem.

I can't tell you the number of kids in my special ed class where I have a lot of 1st and 2nd grader readers in a 7th grade class. They are doing well and are proud of themselves. I have one kid with behavior problems and a bad home life, where the only thing he has been successful in has been his reading.

I see at least one of the DD kids moving right along.

If you are talking about the things that made it hard to start the program, one of the things that we felt was the lack of books. We had a lot of books that we didn't have tests for.

I have some of the high students write tests for books for which we don't have tests. I have some tests for books that some kids like to read but don't have tests.

I couldn't get into the LIT grant page to input information.

I wrote a ton of tests for the really low readers. We had a lot of special ed books that didn't have tests. We wrote about 80 tests for books we had in our room, but didn't have tests for. One of our parents helped write the tests.

I bought tests for books we won't have in our library, but bought the test so kids can take it if they get the book in public library.

Staff Development

"How valuable the Reading Renaissance workshops were to be motivated and energized and ready to not only do it in my class, but get everyone else in the school doing it too.
They were that powerful. Training was key in implementation of the grant."

I would say training was the key. Even though we would communicate with other staff members, they would say "I don't know what you are talking about. A little farther in we started talking about it (staff and parent who took the classes) we had teachers starting to come onboard. When the first grade teacher came onboard, then the other 1st grade teachers saw what it would do. The STAR printout was key to unlock the door—they could see what a program could do for them. I recommend to all the staff that they take the 1st workshop.

I think that for the 4th grade teachers who were the last group to buy into it, our principal encouraged them to take the last Reading Renaissance workshop. They all came back ready to try it. They had heard about it but no one was interested in trying it until they came and got the training.

Outcomes

No I cannot keep some books on the shelf. Particular books I cannot keep on the shelf. They are reading quality literature, probably for the first time.

We have books that have been on the shelves that had never been read, and now they are reading them. They are reading books that before every once in a while you have a rare kid that would read them. I have a huge number of kids that are reading these classics.

We were that way, and what we did was to see what disks we have. They are mowing through the books that we already have. The thing that I've seen in my classroom is that one person will read something and it will go down the line and pretty soon they are discussing books among themselves. Am adapting the basal reader skills to the AR reading that the students are doing. I've got this boy who was at the pre-primer level at first, now he's got Marvin Redpost, Why Pick on Me—he found an example of suspense in his book sitting next to someone reading A Wrinkle in Time. People discussing authors.

I haven't heard books being discussed like this---ever. In my room, in the cafeteria lunchline, in the hallway. I had a girl call a publisher because she wants a third book in the series, which isn't due out until August. She tried to find out how to get the book.. I've never had a student ask to call a publisher because they were so into a book.

One success story of a little guy who was so low he couldn't test out on STAR. He started with really simple books and we have watched him grow. He would come up and ask if he could read his AR book to the librarian; he would give up his recess to come into the library and read his AR book . What a change from September to June. We use Saxon math program and the teacher and paraprofessional have both noted how this boy has grown—he has the self confidence and is reading his math worksheets well with no problem at all. It is being carried over into other parts of the curriculum.

I have the same kinds of little boys. We did a presentation to the school board—half the class showed up. Just the testimonials from parents were enough. One of the kids had read the non-fiction book about Leontine Price, the opera singer, so they had a video of her singing opera, then talked about opera and listened to Pavarotti and Boccelli, etc. My kindergarten 0.5 boy got up and told about not ever finished reading a book before. He told about the book he read and wanted Miss Kelly to sit by me cause I was afraid of taking the test. Now he has taken 29 tests with an average of 90 and he is now reading books at level 2.6. When I was doing silent reading, they had it down as a science—page turning and looking, but many had not really ever finished a book until this program. One kid who has never really read a book has taken 36 tests with a 94% average. He has 51 points and has raised his reading level by a year. One of the things I always feel guilty about is not doing enough for my high level kids, but here's something they can take and fly . It's the success of the "wild boys" who never sit still who are now finishing books. Even these boys are discussing books. This other boy who was handing in one of every 15 assignments and was defecating himself in his other school and was socially inept, has taken 34 tests—he came up to me and was proud that he was reading a book and was carrying on a discussion with the ESL girl who has.

Non-fiction part—I have been going to Timberline to check out books to augment our library's selection. To have a kid come up and say that they were moved by a book—hasn't happened in 17 years. The students were comparing information in the non-fiction books to cartoon depictions. They have little a ha moments front, right and center.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

They are looking for some funds for books. Our librarian is not a supporter. It has been hard for her that the children have been reading so many library books. Wearing out the library books. That may be an outcome to get the funds. The certified person who is the librarian is more technical and doesn't know books. One advantage is that since the librarian has been unhelpful, the kids have had to be more independent and have learned to find the books they want. Several of us are hitting garage sales and thrift shops and have built classroom libraries for AR.

I believe you need the librarian onboard. The librarian can really help direct students towards books in their reading level, etc.

The librarian needs to come onboard. I notice that I have less time for administrative work since I am in there recommending books to students and marking books, etc.
That person needs to know the curriculum well enough to recommend non-fiction as well as fiction. I have found some test disks that support the curriculum and have found good non-fiction. There is a level of kids that love non-fiction.

Our librarian has pushed non-fiction, and it has been hard this year for her to watch the fiction getting more use. So she wants to spend more money on non-fiction tests.

Unanticipated impact
Timberland library wants the list.
Learned about networking and computers—more than I thought I would.
District talking about buying STAR as assessment tool for all the schools. They are asking for the STAR assessment. When they write
Special ed department watch the STAR against the district test.
District assessment coordinator aligned 2nd grade STAR test with QRI results, and was amazed to find them aligned.
Curious to see how the WASL scores increase.
I don't teach a lot of writing, but they are writing prolifically—kids are writing much better since AR, their spelling and writing is improving. What I would have expected a year ago is not what they did.
I would say a big thing is parent involvement.—parents notice that their children are reading a lot. One little kid wanted his mom to ground him so he would get sent to his room and could finish his book.
The transfer to other subjects is another outcome. Those kids that you couldn't get to read out loud are now volunteering and they are figuring out words from context.. Strictly from exposure and practice. I have one kid who would take tests and bomb. I had him read out loud to another person and he started doing better. Then everyone wanted to read out loud. Started this I'll read to you and you read to me attitude.

One outcome is that the kids don't care if they aren't as good a reader as other students aren't.

Have done little incentive—did some additional recess.

We have certificates. We had an anonymous donation of gifts and items. We have a volunteer parent to keep the points for us and we will develop a shopping list and an AR store.

Reading aloud—my husband made 13 PVC pipe telephones. The kids beg for it. They read aloud to themselves. They can hear themselves. Put a spiral notebook on the counter for students to request for test deletion or teachers to ask for a report.

One of the things I like is that this is really nice for the high readers. Set up a point club this year. I set rewards for the point clubs. Setting some of the high point goals was a challenge. That was really worth it. Fifteen kids who earned 100 points were taken to see Cyrano in Olympia. Those kids had a great time and were so well behaved—they were high readers and had worked all year to achieve. The language of the play was really rich for the students. ASB funded it. For good readers it was nice to hear the elegant language. Spurred some of them to find the script online to read it. Did a 50-point pizza club. We have been talking about how to get more funds for incentives.

PTSA gives $1200 year for rewards. There is a core group of kids that you don't know what to do to reward.

Best incentive for the 5-point club, I made bookmarks. I ran some bookmarks off and through the laminator. They got to pick one. That was enough incentive to get them started.

I also made bookmarks for the little kids they had the zone on the back. Do the color zone on the back of the bookmark.

PTSA budgets $1200 for prizes. I 'm at the point now that many of the prizes just come to me because it's well known that I will take them. Teachers clean out their closets. Somebody gave us stuffed animals. How do you decide what gets so many points.

Discussion on incentives and points—record is there, but start new points. Delete all kindergarten and 1st grade tests.

Discussion on points starting and when you run reports for classroom teachers.

How could it be improved?
Having access to the stuff before school starts so you don't have to wait for the techies to install.
Have the training when the software is available.
All in all this was the most hassle free easy to apply for grant ever received.
We impacted kids, and family and teachers.
People judge AR out of context.
Schools that have AR but don't use Reading Renaissance probably don't have success with the program.
There's something that is working.
I think it's the first time that classroom teachers ever really know what their students reading levels are. They think they do, but they don't. and the kids know.

One of the things I have done for at-risk report is to highlight the students that need to move up. I point out the need for students to increase their % rather than the point.

I found that with my really low readers, they don't retain information very well, so they don't pass the test.

If it's a school where the staff who is involved knows nothing about the technology, have the technologist come. I don't think the parapro participation was as valuable as it would have been to have another teacher involved in the training It was the RR stuff that really made the difference.

It was an accident why I was involved. Communicate to the staff what its going to require—the schools really need to have someone who is gung ho. I don't think as much would have been done if I had more on my plate this year.

There's a school that had an assistant that refused to mark books. There was no hope. If she wasn't going to do it and the principal wasn't going to make her do it, then he should have hired someone else to come in a do it.

How do you identify the leader?
Maybe you need to have these buildings prove their commitment to the grant before they get the money.

It was easy to get into this grant process. I made a commitment

The enthusiasm has spread like mold and mildew throughout the building

In my room I have 3 computers for kids to take AR—the computers are busy a lot with AR tests. How can you do it with just 2 in the library?

LIT Focus Group Discussion
Hoquiam High School
June 9, 1999
12 Participants

Implementation

I feel that the biggest help in our building is that our librarian got on board even before the computers were working. And she spent a couple hundred hours getting every book in the library color-coded. I happen to be the queen of the paperbacks so I had an excess of 300 AR titles myself. And I have multiple copies and I split them off to other teachers and she color coded our room collections." Linda Gelovich the saint. She has been so good about that.

I have a business in the students earned over $1000 on cookie sales and if there are any monies left, then the money is going to buy more AR tests and paperbacks because my students are so pleased and I looked at our collection and it will not support the program. We don't have adequate chartreuse, or rose of aqua. So both ends of our collection. That was the key. And once we could be up and running. The people from Houston actually cam e down to our building to try to install it. Within three days of use of the technical support number, everything was up and running.

I have two machines, and it's a fight (with the number of kids on the computer) and God forbid if I don't give them their hour of AR.

I found the first month a general resistance to getting into it. The typical things you have with this, then little by little you could see the children buying into this.

I wanted to get feedback from some high school people about classroom novels being on the AR. At the high school when we got into it, some of the teachers before they were trained (We're not all trained yet, but almost there) All the 9th graders are doing it this year. They (teachers) were thinking that their classroom novels were on there and they wanted their students to come and take a test. But there's a difference between reading for details like the AR program and reading and discussing a classroom novel. They read it over a longer period of time, and often the reading level is high for some of the students. I have talked to some of the teachers about the process and purpose of the classroom novel vs. AR So I'm wondering if we want to do that.. When the teachers get together at the end of the year, we will discuss that and I'm leaning towards not using the classroom novel for AR.

I think it's a different way of reading.
It's unavoidable because it's a selling point with the teachers. They like to teach whole class, and they like their whole class to be able to take a test. And they want to use it for assessment. But I personally think it's a misuse of AR. Because it's supposed to help their reading level because if you have the whole class read a particular novel, the reading level will not be fair for half of the class. I have made the point to the teachers that it's not in their zone and its not the purpose. It can turn them off to AR.

Well I think the teachers can understand because I had a new teacher come in and I started talking to him about it and he said I can do this and he had two boys take a test on a book they started

reading three months prior. They were good students, but they failed the test. I said, now you see the difference between the classroom reading and AR. The teacher started nodding and he understood that he was using the book to teach literary concepts and he said I understand how this (AR) is different from that.. I don't think we'll have any trouble trying to separate those two, but the other problem we run into is that somebody will slip through the cracks and pick a novel that is a classroom novel two years down the road. The teachers don't want that happening. People don't want that 9th grader to read a junior novel. That is just a dilemma we are going to have to work through.

It would be really easy to mark those classroom novels with a sticker . I would think you could work that through.

At my level I read to our children all the time, everyday. I allowed them to take the test if they chose. Some of them went and reviewed the book before taking the test. I think you can make some provisions as a teacher with that kind of a thing, but I can see what you're saying. It is difficult because we have done some novels, and sometimes like today, a child said, I thought I had the right version of James and the Giant Peach, but I didn't.

At the high school level, do you have to have a monitor where they take their test? Do you have all sorts of craziness going on?

I have a server down here and its served up to the English classes. We only did two classes this year, but one main teacher did it in all his English classes. His AR computer is right by his desk and he lets them take tests when he is there Now I let them take it on the server this year in the beginning, but the ideal next year is that they will just take it in the classroom.

I don't think some of the teachers realize the accountability that needs to be there. For one of my nephews in a Federal Way school, the teacher had heard about it, but let the 6th grade class go independent with self monitoring, well they found out about a month into it that there were about six kids who were taking the tests for everybody. Kids or a certain element of kids may try to get around the system.

I have certified AR helpers. I have about five students who troubleshoot and have fixed the one printer in the library and they teach other students in the school to take the tests. I have one girl who has to have a certified helper. We send our certified helpers down to the 1st grade. I have children who still don't take a test by themselves.

I would have liked to have the ability to run the tests myself. But in our building we had to go through our overworked tech person, so I always felt like I was imposing. We started out with the idea that every Friday a report would be run, but after the first three weeks we realized that wasn't going to happen. So it's just awkward to ask someone else to do something that just a basic part of the program. Not having the computer itself made it difficult. We had that new computer that is in the computer lab not in my classroom Instead it ended up running the whole school's programs and even when we got a new server it stayed there. When I questioned the administration about that, it still stayed there. I was really unhappy about that. Had I had that computer, I would have been able to run my own.

We used the computer furnished as our server. You don't need a high powered computer to run the tests, and every teacher has a computer in their room, so it made sense to use the iMac for the server. It is a dedicated server running only AR and STAR,.

Another limiting thing was that we had fewer than 200 books. When it was just my classroom alone, that was fine, but as of May 1, we decided we were going to train and allow all students to do that, and a couple of classrooms did that and consequently my kids had no books to read. So they were reading other books and enjoying their reading, but they weren't getting any AR points for it. So they were real disappointed.

We got books, but we didn't have tests for the books we have. We had no other tests.

That was a limiting thing for us too. Because at the middle school, I didn't have variety in the levels of books. It was kind of drastic to tell a child that you have to read within your range and it was difficult to sell books that aren't right for them. We needed to have a good selection. My building has opted to get all the teachers to use their money on purchasing books.

We all started in our classroom. We all got classroom money, so we are spending it to make sure we get some books.

Several teachers talked among themselves about using WRC grant monies to pay for more books for next year.

Ours is a K-1 building so we are rather unique since there aren't many low-level books that we could use especially at the beginning of the year. We really couldn't start until January . I don't think even next year we can start at the very beginning, except for the few high kids. They can't take the STAR test most of them. We wait to take the STAR test in January.

In Hood Canal, they have an Americorp reading person hired for the summer and she's going to be making AR test disks based on Open Court booklets—the little readers that come with the primary Open Court program. I don't know what kind of sharing could happen.

I got a printout from the Internet where you can get handmade tests, but you don't know about the quality.

It might be something to look into. But everything just takes time, and we have no library help. We (teachers) had to spend days to go through our library and label all the books. And we aren't done. And we are like Marie which is what Debbie Kilcup told us, we started with one or two people, then everybody wants to do it. The kids are excited, they're talking reading and everybody wants to do it. And that's what happened and we were going to open it up to all the other classes that had readers, but we didn't have enough books or computers, so we are waiting until next year. They finally got it on the server, but our tech person is hired for 2 1/2 hours a day and she's already there for about 8 hours a day and she says she can't manage it.

Washington has all the teachers implementing.

Our most limiting factor was the technology set-up. We truly did not get started until March. Our librarian was very supportive, but trying to get the people out of the district—our head technology person to come to the building and get it set up was a big problem. Once I did get set up, it was wonderful. And we have other teachers who would have liked to be on it this spring, but due to the fact that we did not have enough books, the library books had not been catalogued, and we needed to decide what books to get extra disks for, we made a school decision that they will all be on September 1.

We had questions about that (the amount of reading time) when we first went to training—you want our 6 year olds to do it for 20-30 minutes? On some days we had them reading 40-45 minutes and they didn't want to stop. At that point our problem was not having enough books or computers in our room. because they all wanted to take their tests at the same time. Not being able to take their tests quick enough so we were having a sign up sheet but sometimes it wasn't until the next day and I know that is not the best way to do it.

For the most part it worked really well for us, but my concern is that next year we have to put all those books back in the library . We checked them out from the library as the pilot classroom and we have to give them back.

Not having the right level at the beginning of the year was a real problem for me. And when they (students) took off, not having another copy was an issue.
Another limitation—when we got onto the grant, nobody seemed to understand how it was going to work,and I think the librarian needed to be a part of it at every school. And instead in some of our cases, the technology person went, and really it should have been the librarian. But in our elementary school they don't have certified librarians so. . .they are a library tech person and the tech person is an ed assistant. In some schools, they are not there all day or they have other duties like recess duty, so it's really stretching it.

That's really impacted us because the kids can't -the library's only open some times, so they can only go at certain times of the day, Well, when you take away your pull out time, and the band times three days a week, if those times happen to be the times that the librarian is in, it really does (impact) the program. If a student finishes a book and passes a test, they are all excited and want to go get another book right away. And they can't/

I think that's just like the computers though. Whether you have a computer in the room or they have to go someplace else, or whether it's your room library or the school library, or even a traveling library. Next year in our building, we are going to put a quantity of books on a cart.. They will be library books, but they are going to go on a cart to the different English classes., so that—this is middle school, you really don't want them (students) our in the hall traveling back and forth, we want them in the room.

Our librarian has classes in there, so you don't want to go bombing in, so what I would do is check out books in areas I was weak in (rose or aqua) and I would take 20 or 30 into the classroom since I was the pilot. They (students) would sell the books to one another. That helped.

Even at a lower grade it helped to check out books on a rotating basis, and then the kids who had gone through chartreuse could return 10 books and get 10 new ones. And just rotate a small classroom library on a weekly basis or something.

Not having enough books hurt everybody everywhere. Actually I thought not being able to get onboard right away was really kind of a plus for us cause then we all of sudden realized that we didn't have enough books and this was going to snowball. So we spent our library budget, $3000 on books. And that was nice because they came and we still weren't ready and I got lots of practice and had high school help to put the labels and dots on, and I would have never been able to do that in September. So I was glad to have all that time.

Our school library closed this week, so the librarian could get the books shelved, and I just went down with the list and labeled some of the books that hadn't been labeled yet.

I told my kids that it would be a good idea to read some AR books over the summer and review them in the fall when they come back.

Real limitation is that at the middle school it is part of English. Reading fits in with English, but there's so much other stuff that has to be covered. There's a lot of curriculum that has to be covered.

I just think we should all feel lucky that Debbie Hale did this for us and they were willing to put up with the headaches. Kind of embarrassing that we get the grant due to the ESD then the district goes to bat against the ESD to make sure that all our buildings are treated equally. In the end we are so thankful that we got this. It's tremendous to have kids reading again.

I think we could have had more consistency in the district if we would have had someone district wide dealing with this at all schools.

Incentives:
Raffle
Glider planes, stuffed animals, pocketbooks, and planners—it was easy finding things for boys. A lot of water bubble things.
We aren't giving a thing and they are happy.
Aide gives out raffle ticket coins that are for test passing, reading levels, etc. They win a pop.
We do a raffle too. Every time they pass a test they get a raffle ticket. Every Friday we do something—one Friday we draw for two certificates that lets them out of class 5 minutes early for lunch. Good for 5 days. The other certificate is getting out of class—they can go visit another class with the ok of the other teacher, they can go to the library, they can go to the student center, or they can go to the other lunch. So they can go down and have lunch with their friends. On the other Friday, we do Treasure Chest where we open up our Treasure Chest of prizes.

I did my raffle with different colors so you could reward kids for different things.

Has anyone ever done the mileage things---we sent away for charms that say 10, 15, 25, 50, then the kids put them on their shoelaces when they reach those goals. There are all sorts of other charms too. We give those out when they reach major milestones.

We did give a bead away. If somebody did something nice they got a bead—it would be easy to adapt that to the incentives.

In the beginning, I decided that I didn't want it to be competitive, so we focused on the number of books the class had read, and the number of class points. We were focused on getting to a class goal,--that removed the competition. It can be really bloody when you have students reading low point books. I didn't want to deal with an economy and this gives them something to look forward to that's done at junior high.

We give a Tiger slip—our principal gives them little thing when they reach a certification level. They aren't big things, but your name is mentioned throughout the school on the intercom. That is a positive thing.

Staff Development

You know what? The training was very important.

What we did in our building is that I came back from the training and ran a mini inservice and explained the components to classified staff and teachers who had not gone to the training. Basic training so the assistants can help with the tasks—everybody has really bought into it. The management tool is fantastic for the principal because she has the capability of calling up each classroom and seeing where each classroom is. That is going to be one of the focal points of our staff meetings next year is to talk about where the AR is . There are only two classrooms that have not gotten involved. But it caught on like wildfire and with a librarian that was so supportive and actually read two books that looked suspicious and two of them were inappropriate. (short discussion of book)

There was general concurrence that they are having to train and support other staff in their buildings.

One school is using the SLIBG money to train all staff by the end of the year. She (librarian? Administrator?) has freed up that money since she felt so compelled. She called up the technology people and got the number for support of the Macintosh and got us up and running and solved our problem. That is essential to have someone who is pushing. We did presentations for our parent support group and they are on board and have money and will spend money for books and test disks.

One of the primary school wants to bring some additional training for all staff into its school. Suggestions (discussion of brokerage of training by ESD)

That was the best training I have ever been to.

I am a disruptive learner if the presenter is not up to par. The quality of the training was excellent. We don't want to put up with poor training and waste our time.

I think it should be a team of the teacher and librarian. And an administrator. Some of the elementary have librarians and some don't.

Outcomes

That is the amazing thing about it. Do you have a low reader success story?

Actually I have a child that made two years growth since November. He started out at 3.4 and is now a 5.4. And even my resource room children -I have a 1.6 that went to a 2.2 and he is a child who read a 2.9 book today with a 90% test score. He does a lot of Duoleg and he shares his books. I have 9 whales, which are my Star readers; I have three who have read at least one or two towards their classic certification, and everybody 's independent,, then I have all but three who are Super. I know this because we had our Super Reader party today which was root beer floats, on Friday we have Seahorse which is advanced and is banana splits, and Monday, the whales are having lunch. I couldn't get over what effect it has.

What I thought was interesting was that there were children that I thought were high level readers who were scoring poorly on their comprehension tests. And it became a red alert to all of us. Because they could hand in terrific little written packets, but they couldn't get 80% on comprehension. And one little girl is still struggling. There is something that I have to work on, that I would never had identified if I hadn't had the AR program.. We need to work on this more and more—she's very inconsistent. (Discussion of student problems) I would never had known that about her if I hadn't had this different approach to reading.

This little girl who made the two years growth constantly pushed me because she started out in rose. She wanted to read War with Grandpa, and I told her you're not ready, you're going to crash and burn, but she was so persistent that I said go ahead and take it, and she took the test and got 100% plus she analyzed the make-up of the test. She said there are questions at the beginning of the book and some in the middle and some from the end. I now just let her go for It., sometimes if I don't do status of the class, they fall through the cracks. I run the reading report and check their reading logs. The students have learned that the computer keeps track of what they have done. The children want to know about the certification. The strength of the program is how well you work the strategies.

There's just no doubt about it -we read for 60 minutes a day and the only way I could find that time was to do when it my host kids were there back to back. They only read for half and hour and had host instruction for half an hour. That dedicated time to practice reading really works. Three's so many people that don't want to give up class time for that, but its so valuable.

The first class that came in here after we had done the STAR—they came in and wanted to jump on this cart of brand new books—not just the ones that were upstairs and old, but the brand new books. They just dove into those. There were kids sitting on the stairs, kids sitting everywhere actually -they wanted to jump right in. And it would have been sad if we hadn't had that.

Discussion of use of the public library and giving the public librarian the AR notebook with list of titles.

A lot of my kids ended up going to the library on their own.
They would go but they wouldn't know which books were AR.
There's a binder at the Hoquiam Library from Washington School

My librarian is there in June and August and will have the library open and kids can come in for AR and the Americorp volunteer.

That's what I'm trying to do—set up a summer reading program in our school one night a week.

Unanticipated Impacts:
Kids staying in at recess to read.

Yeah that was kind of unexpected.

My lowest kid progressed more than anyone in the class. He was at pre-primer and now he's up to 3.9.

We didn't think AR was appropriate for our building because it was PreK-1, but Debbie Kilcup suggested that we still go ahead and do it. We are finding that we are really helping the higher students—those are the ones that we do a disservice to because we are focusing on the lower ones.

I established book bags to go home with my kids, and that has been really great cause the parents get on board and they see what their kids are reading. Especially those over achievers.

We have an after school program in the junior high , and they have given us $2000 to buy more tests . That really helped because the kids were asking how about this book? All of a sudden we could buy these tests and the kids were going bananas. They helped us with some prizes as well. They have been working with us -they came to us.

At one of our meetings, we had a couple of parents who were against the program because their children didn't like it. It has been turned around, but that was a shock to me. But there were tremendous supporters through. These were students who were good readers, but skimmers and they found they had trouble passing the tests. Those individuals are now participating.

I had a little boy this year who came in and started to read and got really fast. Before we started AR, I was encouraging him to be fast. But in January when we started AR, he would read the book and not pass the test. It took three weeks for him to understand to read more thoroughly. I don't think that if it hadn't been for AR, I would have caught that.

It has been a nice blend with our new reading series. They work well together. I charted where they were and showed the student their growth. One of my more reluctant reader was looking at it and said, Oh, so this AR stuff does work."

I had a lot of paperback books and I can't get paperback books anymore. I have to get hardback because the kids are reading so much, the books are falling apart. The bindings are coming off. There's so much more usage of the books, they are falling apart.
Circulation increases—she can't keep the books on the shelf.

I think that's why some of the teachers started working on their room sets—it was just too much work for the librarian to keep the books on the shelf.

Our librarian said she had more non-fiction books checked out before, and now there are more fiction books being checked out.

That's what I hoped was going to happen. I had the principal in observing when we had AR kids in here and it substantiated that we need the money that's in the book budget.

We got a nice donation from someone who donated before, but they upped it and we were really pleased. We explained all about AR . Last year they gave us $1000, but this year they gave $2500 which will all be used to buy more AR books.

One thing I found was that not many AR books are on the scholastic book orders. Discussion about scholastic developing a similar software with their titles.

Books at least for elementary (AR) are classic books that have been around for a while, but Scholastic puts out new things.

On conference night I had every student read Harold and the Purple Crayon, while I was talking to the parent, then I had them take the test while their parents watched. I had originally invited parents to take tests, but found out we don't have room for their accounts.

The curriculum person helped us buy expansion disks since we have additional students coming on next year.

Next Steps
We are constantly fighting for more funds for books and disks.

Is anyone else finding it hard to get the 60 minutes? Nobody wants to give up the time to read. One of our goals is going to be getting more staff to buy into this so we can ask for more time to read. Getting teacher buy in is hard.

We have heard reports that there are teachers using AR as their complete reading program and that's not what it's for. That can cause some frustrated negative things going on. Report of a teacher using the AR reports to connect to grade and the anecdote of a student who was turned off reading because of it. I hope teachers keep being reminded that's its not a complete reading program.

In the beginning I was trying to use AR as a means to develop a grade, but the RR trainers said not to do that, so I developed other ways to determine a grade for the students.

Our primary concern as we look towards implementing Open Court next year is whether we would have adequate time to read. I want to have the time for practice. After going through the Open Court training, I think I will be able to get 40 minutes. The practicing can't help to enhance any reading program.

Even our kids starting at mid-year were able to do it because of the strong skills they developed through Open Court.

As the statistics show that the students are improving their reading, I'm hoping that more people will give more time at the upper levels.. We are so desperately trying to raise the level of our kids to the standards that I'm hoping there is some impact we can connect to AR.

I think we will get better by understanding the collections of books that we have. We will choose our collections better.

We already have teachers talking about the selections of novels—we have some 9th graders testing out rather low and some of our novels are too high.

We have a class that's doing something pretty interesting. It's an American History/Lit combination and they came up a list of novels and looked at the AR list and picked out those dealing with the time period and are letting students choose any of those to read. That gives students a range.

At the secondary level people argue that students are reading in other subject areas, but it is my understanding that that is not the same kind of reading as AR reading. And that is a little frustrating to explain to staff and administrators.

We had to get our computer act together because all the kids in the school have expectations that they are going to do this program.

Discussion on self-esteem—one teacher was advised by a librarian not to tell kids their reading level because that might hurt their self-esteem. We just celebrate the fact that they are moving up.

The students want to move up but they also want to be successful.

Discussion about readers that are young but high level readers—how does appropriateness of material enter into the equation?

The reason why many of the readers want to read the books outside their zone. They should be allowed to do It.. Discussion of pushing students along vs. allowing students to read at a comfortable level. Teachers thought that students will bounce themselves up when they read things outside their zone.

I want to infect all my students with the love of reading.

I think that's the nicest thing with status of the class, you do get to share with a broader number of kids what you are reading.

They want recommendations of books -when was the last time that's happened?

One of the spin offs is that wer had one kid who was reading and that was when we didn't have as many books. And this student read My Brother Sam is Dead and he said he wouldn't have read it except for AR and found that he really liked it. And because he read it and is well respected, two or three other kids also read it. I thought that was kind of interesting.

I can say as a parent that my high school daughter is bringing home things to read that she wouldn't have chosen before.

Kids are talking to other kids about books. They have personal book lists of books they want to read next. They have books stacked on their desks that they want to read.

Please send all responses to Jennifer VanderGalien
Renaissance Learning
901 Deming Way Suite 101
Madison, WI 53717
608-664-3880

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Language Integrated Technology Project Final Evaluation Report	
Author(s): Lois Stiegemeier	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: Aug 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Lois A Stiegemeier	Printed Name/Position/Title: Lois Stiegemeier, owner
Organization/Address: Educational Technology Consulting 3203 Scotch Meadows Ct SE Olympia, WA 98501	Telephone: 360 923-5820 FAX: 360 923-0907 E-Mail Address: lstieg@attbi.com Date: 2/7/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org